

THE
Eclectic Review.

APRIL, 1853.

ART. I.—*Hippolytus and His Age ; or, The Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus ; and Ancient and Modern Christianity and Divinity Compared.*
By Christian Charles Josias Bunsen, D.C.L. 4 vols. 12mo.
London : Longman and Co. 1852.

No well-informed man is ignorant of the rank held by the author of the volumes before us, as one of the master-spirits of the age. A Prussian by birth, and the representative of his sovereign at the Court of St. James's, an Englishman by long residence amongst us, but still more by genial sympathy with our national character and institutions, the Chevalier Bunsen's reputation as a scholar and philosopher has emblazoned his name on the burgess-roll of the world. Not only wherever the German language is spoken, or, to borrow a snatch from the National Anthem,—

‘Woher die Deutsche Zunge klingt,
Und Gott im Himmel Lieder singt,’

but also over the far wider sweep where our own is understood, his profound thoughts have found an echo. The indirect influence which he exerts through the works of those whose minds have been fertilized by intimacy with his own, is perhaps quite as extensive as that which flows so widely when he wields the pen in person. To cite but a single instance out of many. What theological or even general library could be deemed com-

plete without the productions of Thomas Arnold? And what would the master of Rugby have been as a Christian politician, historian, and divine, but for the *rapport* into which he was providentially brought with the author of these volumes, one of which, we may observe, he has appropriately dedicated to the memory of his great disciple? This was the source of that Promethean fire which animated the *rudis indigestaque moles* of an Oxford clergyman into a man. To Arnold, as to many others, the University was a mere Demiurge; his true Alma Mater was the Prussian Embassy. And he is but one out of many men of mark in science, art, and literature, whose intellectual life has been quickened by contact with the same powerful mind which is as encyclopædic as it is original and profound. The present labour of the Chevalier's pen yields not in interest and worth to any that have preceded it. We should have been ashamed for our country at the unmannerly reception with which so flattering a contribution by a distinguished foreigner to our national literature has been met by a few, but that the bark and the blindness sufficiently betray the grade to which the censors belong. To the completeness of a Roman triumph, the mows and gibes of some trained buffoon in front of the car of victory were always held essential; and we see not why a knight of the Teutonic Order, who has so fairly fought his way to the Walhalla, should be refused this additional zest.

A word or two on the origin of these volumes. It is somewhat analogous to that of a work with which most of our readers are acquainted—we mean Mr. Carlyle's 'Past and Present.' The disentanglement by the Camden Society of some curious autobiographical memoirs of a notable monk of Bury was eagerly seized upon by that original writer as the occasion of reading to the world one of his favourite homilies on the earnestness of the olden time as contrasted with the *laissez faire*, &c., of our own degenerate days. In like manner we owe to the publication in 1851, by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, of a recently-discovered treatise written by a Christian father of the beginning of the third century,* the invaluable production before us; which is also a 'Past and Present' in its way; for we may observe that its supplementary title, 'Ancient and Modern Christianity and Divinity Compared,' is far more descriptive of the great bulk of the contents than its leading one. The long-lost patristic treasure was brought from Mount Athos to Paris in 1842, along with other valuable MSS., including the sprightly 'Fables' of Babrius,

* The title it bears is the following:—'Origenis Philosophumena sive omnium hæresium refutatio. E codice Parisino nunc primum ed. Emmanuel Miller.'

the 'Gymnastica' of Philostratus, and the 'Dialectica' of Galen, all now first restored to the learned world. The discoverer was a Greek, Mynoides Mynas by name, who had been sent out in search of MSS. at the expense of the French government, by that eminent scholar M. de Villemain, then Minister of Public Instruction. Of these newly recovered works, those belonging to profane literature met at once with the attention they deserved, whereas the Christian treatise was actually overlooked for years, and had a narrow escape of being a second time interred. To this neglect several circumstances contributed. It was anonymous; the manuscript was of cotton paper not older than the fourteenth century; and the superscription, 'A Refutation of all Heresies,' was by no means an inviting one. At length, however, in 1846, M. Emmanuel Miller, the official in the Royal Library who had the charge of arranging and cataloguing the recently acquired codices, was struck by some fragments of Pindar, and of an unknown lyric poet, cited in the work, and was thus led to a closer scrutiny of the whole. He was soon convinced of its being an authentic production of a Christian writer of the former half of the third century, whom, from the identity of the first of the ten books which it must originally have comprised, with a piece ascribed by the editors to Origen, as well as from a marginal note in the manuscript itself, he concluded to be no other than the great Alexandrian divine. Under this impression (too hastily imbibed, as it now turns out), he at once placed himself in communication with the authorities of the Oxford University Press, who readily promised to print it, and engaged him to edit it forthwith. Soon after its appearance, Dr. Tregelles made it known to the Chevalier, who, stimulated by the interest with which, according to his informant, the venerable Dr. Routh, and other learned Oxonians, had perused the work, made haste to procure a copy, and, within less than a week, had written to Archdeacon Hare the first of the Five Letters which make up his opening volume. His enthusiasm we can partly understand, since we ourselves gave no sleep to our eyes after the arrival of our copy till we had perused it at a sitting. The following are the conclusions which the Chevalier announced at this early stage of his inquiries:—

'First. That the work before us is genuine, but not by Origen.

'Secondly. That it is the work of Hyppolytus, a person much celebrated, but very little known.

'Thirdly. That this celebrated father and martyr, Hippolytus, was a presbyter of the Church of Rome, and bishop of the harbour of Rome, *Portus*, but neither an Arab, nor an Arabian bishop, as a Frenchman imagined he might, and Cave said that he must, have been,

‘Fourthly. That this book is full of valuable authentic extracts from lost writers.’—Vol. i. p. 9.

To the task of proving these facts the Chevalier addresses himself in the remaining Letters. That the work cannot belong to Origen is easily shown. The only marvel is that so good a scholar as M. Miller (who, however, shows himself far more at home in classical than in ecclesiastical lore), should have allowed himself to be betrayed by an ignorant copyist, and by a mistake of former editors of Origen’s productions, into a far less venial blunder. In our opinion, the Chevalier lets off M. Miller, and, we may add, the Oxford Delegates, far too easily in so clear a case of lese majesty against the republic of letters. How M. Miller, after transcribing these Greek sheets, could have intitled them Origen’s, and written his Latin preface, we are at a loss to imagine; and scarcely less so, how all this could have passed under the eyes of Oxford scholars without an immediate detection of so glaring an indiscretion. We would say nothing of the silence of antiquity as to Origen’s having written a treatise ‘Against all Heresies;’ nothing of the immense difference between the style of this work and that which so strikingly characterizes all he wrote; nothing of the wide divergence of its theology from his. On all these points the Chevalier very properly expatiates, as also upon the facts that the author styles himself a bishop, which Origen never became, and that he must have been intimately connected with the Roman Church, which Origen never visited but once, and then only for a very short time. It is rather upon this visit of Origen to Rome, compared with the very same portion of the treatise under discussion, to the combined evidence of which M. Miller triumphantly appeals in support of his conclusion, that we would stake the whole question. After showing—what is perfectly correct—that the whole work must have been written by one and the same author, M. Miller, in his preface (p. ix.), goes on to say,—

‘If in any part, therefore, of this *continuous* work we recognise the true and genuine Origen, it will be demonstrated to a certainty that the ten books were written by himself. The martyrdom of St. Callistus the First at once presents itself, which the author narrates in the Ninth Book as having happened a short time after he himself was brought by his affairs to Rome. But Origen is known to have stayed in that city some years (!) under Pope Zephyrinus (of whom frequent mention is made in that narrative), whom Callistus succeeded in the papal dignity in the year 217. By the help of the passage of Origen just adduced, the date when Fuscianus was prefect of Rome can be settled at the same time, whom Corsini,* by conjecture, had assigned to

* Præfectt. Urbis. Pisis, 1763, in 4to, p. 87.

the year 178, whereas we now understand him to have belonged to the year 222.'

Now in this strange passage there are at least as many blunders as lines. Nor is the plea mercifully tendered by the Chevalier, in arrest of judgment upon the culprit and his accomplices, at all sufficient for their exoneration. He suggests (vol. i. p. 136), that M. Miller's mistakes probably originated in a misinterpretation of the words with which the anonymous author prefaces his account of Callistus's proceedings (Philosoph. p. 285.) "He became a martyr under Fuscianus, at that time prefect of Rome; and the manner of his martyrdom was the following." But even if M. Miller was ignorant beforehand of what every tyro in ancient ecclesiastical literature knows perfectly well, that the word *μάρτυρια* in the old Christian writers, does not necessarily, or even most frequently, mean *testimony unto death*, the sequel of Callistus's history, as given in the very passage of the book he had to edit, to which he himself refers, was quite sufficient to enlighten him, unless he either believed that a man could go from Rome to Sardinia and back, be elected to the papal chair, and wield its powers with astonishing vigour after he was dead, or else performed his task whilst under the influence of chloroform. This we know is strong language, but it is fully borne out by the tenour of the passage itself, which furnishes so entirely new and highly piquant a page of the *chronique scandaleuse* of the church of Rome. For immediately after the words before cited, the promised story of Callistus's martyrdom is duly told, together with *its sequel*. It is to the following effect, according to the honest summary of the Chevalier, who has simply premised the few sentences relative to Marcia, one of the *dramatis personæ*, in order to elucidate the narrative:—

'We know that in the latter years of the reign of the unworthy son of the philosophical and virtuous but inefficient Emperor Marcus Aurelius Commodus, his mistress Marcia played a conspicuous part in the history of the palace. She married, as a matter of course, it would appear, the captain of the guards, and was believed to exercise a great influence on the emperor. When his brutal temper became unbearable, she was privy to the conspiracy which put him to death by poison and suffocation.

'Of this Marcia we know already from Dion that she was very kind to the Christians. We learn now from Hippolytus that she was God-loving (*φιλόθεος*), that is to say, that she had been converted to the Christian faith.

'The part she acts in the life of Callistus is peculiarly interesting. There was under Commodus, when Victor was Bishop of Rome, a good Christian soul called Carpophorus, who had a Christian slave of the name of Callistus. To help him on, he gave him the administra-

tion of a bank, which he kept in that celebrated quarter of Rome called the *Piscina publica*. Many brethren and widows trusted their money to this bank, having great faith in the Christian character of Carpophorus. But Callistus turned out a rogue: he made away with the sums entrusted to him; and when the depositors wanted their money it was gone. Their complaints came before Carpophorus; he asked for the accounts; and when the fraud could no longer be concealed, Callistus made his escape. He ran down to the harbour, Portus, some twenty miles from Rome, found a ship ready to start, and embarked. Carpophorus was not slow to follow him, and found the ship moored in the middle of the harbour. He took a boat to claim the criminal. Callistus, seeing no escape, threw himself into the sea, and was with difficulty saved and delivered up to his master, who, taking the matter into his own hands, gave him the domestic treadmill of the Roman slave-owners, the *pistrinum*. Some time passed, and as is wont to happen (says Hippolytus) some brethren came to Carpophorus, and said he ought to give poor Callistus a chance of regaining his character, or at least his money. He pretended that he had money outstanding, and that if he could only go about, he should recover it. "Well," said good Carpophorus, "let him go and try what he can recover: I do not care much for my own money, but I [do] mind that of the poor widows." So Callistus went out on a Sabbath (Saturday), pretending he had to recover some money from the Jews, but in fact having resolved to do something desperate which might put an end to his life, or give a turn to his case. He went into a synagogue, and raised a great riot there, saying he was a Christian, and interrupting their service. The Jews were of course enraged at this insult, fell upon him, beat him, and then carried him before Fuscianus, the prefect of Rome. When this judge, a very severe man, was hearing the cause, somebody recognised Callistus, and ran to tell Carpophorus what was going on. Carpophorus went immediately to the court, and said: "This fellow is no Christian, but wants to get rid of his life, having robbed me of much money, as I will prove." The Jews, thinking this was a Christian stratagem to save Callistus, insisted upon having him punished for disturbing them in the lawful exercise of their worship. Fuscianus therefore sentenced him to be scourged, and then transported to the unwholesome parts of Sardinia, so fatal to life in summer.' (Strabo, v. 2. § 7, 8.)

'Some time after, says Hippolytus, Marcia, wishing to do a good work, sent for Bishop Victor and asked what Christians had been transported to Sardinia; adding, she would beg the emperor to release them. The bishop made out a list of them; but being a judicious and righteous man, omitted the name of Callistus, knowing the offence he had committed.

'Marcia obtained the letter of pardon; and Hyacinthus, a eunuch (of the service of the palace undoubtedly), and a presbyter (of the church), was despatched to the governor of the island to claim and bring back the martyrs. Hyacinthus delivered his list; and Callistus, finding his name was not upon it, began to lament, and entreat, and

at last moved Hyacinthus to demand his liberation also. Here the text is somewhat obscure; but thus much is clear, that his liberation was obtained by bringing the name of Marcia into play.

'When Callistus made his appearance Victor was very much vexed; the scandal had not been forgotten, and Carpophorus (his lawful master) was still alive. So he sent him off to Antium (Porto d'Anzo), and gave him a certain sum a month. Whether it was here Callistus fell in with Zephyrinus, or at Rome itself, no sooner was Carpophorus dead, than Zephyrinus, now become bishop of Rome, made him his coadjutor to keep his clergy in order, and gave himself up to him so entirely, that Callistus did with him what he liked. Unfortunately, says Hippolytus, Zephyrinus was not only very stupid and ignorant, but, loving money very much, took bribes. Things went on in this way until Zephyrinus died, when Callistus was elected to the eminent post he had coveted all the time. He became bishop of Rome, and the theological disputes in that church began to be envenomed.'—Vol. i. pp. 126—131.

From this abstract of the narrative, to the substantial accuracy of which a repeated examination of the original passage enables us willingly to pledge ourselves, the reader will be in a position to form an opinion whether our censure of M. Miller's carelessness is at all too severe. How could he help seeing that Callistus's condemnation by Fuscianus, 'so far from causing his death,' to use the words of the Chevalier, 'on the contrary, made his fortune'? Or that the martyrdom, such as it was, must have taken place at least some time before the close, if not before the beginning of the reign of Commodus, at whose death in A.D. 192 Origen was but seven years old? Indeed, there seems no reason whatever for unsettling Corsini's date of the præfecture of Fuscianus—viz., 178, and if that be correct, then Origen, if he witnessed this extraordinary martyrdom, must have done so seven years *before* he was born, so that it is no wonder he believed in the pre-existence of souls! Again, if, as Eusebius states (Hist. Eccles., lib. vi. cap. 14), the great Alexandrian father's short visit to Rome took place during the episcopate of Zephyrinus, what can be clearer than the inference that he came thither too late, by at least one pontificate, to witness the martyrdom, and therefore was *not* the writer of the 'Refutation of all Heresies?'

Of course not one of the learned men who have as yet pronounced on the question of the authorship of the anonymous treatise has followed M. Miller in ascribing it to Origen, and we observe whilst writing, that in the recent advertisements of the book in the columns of the 'Times' a modest query, and the addition 'sive Hippolyti (?)' appear in the title. We should think, too, that when the Chevalier's arguments shall have been fairly weighed, critical opinion will be equally unanimous in

favour of the claim of Hippolytus. Already, before their publication, this conclusion was arrived at independently by Professor Jacobi, Dr. Duncker, and other distinguished scholars. The only other candidate hitherto started is the Roman presbyter Caius, a contemporary of Hippolytus. But his pretensions are easily set aside. For, apart from all antiquity's being ignorant of his ever having written such a work, he never, any more than Origen, rose above the rank of a presbyter. Besides, we know from Eusebius (H. E. lib. iii. cap. 28) that he thought the 'Apocalypse' was written by Cerinthus, whereas our author distinctly attributes it to the apostle John. On the other hand, a work with the very same title as that borne by our treatise, is cited as belonging to Hippolytus, by Peter bishop of Alexandria (who was martyred in 311), by Eusebius, and by Jerome, as well as by Photius, who gives us such a description of it as remarkably tallies with the recently exhumed remains. Photius says that the work discussed thirty-two heresies, commencing with Dositheanism, and ending with Noetianism; as also that in it, Hippolytus, who was a disciple of Irenæus, had borrowed freely from his master, with a due acknowledgment of his obligations. These important particulars, the Chevalier, in his Second Letter to Archdeacon Hare, carefully verifies by an elaborate critical analysis of the 'Refutation,' extending through a hundred pages (vol. i. pp. 21—122), pointing out as he goes along the rich mines of new and valuable information, which glittering deposits on the surface invite us to rifle of their wealth. Indeed he goes so far as to affirm that by the discovery of this lost work, our means of acquiring a knowledge of early Christianity are fully doubled—a statement which seems to us a little overcharged. There can be no doubt, however, that he does not much overrate the worth of the numerous authentic extracts, here furnished for the first time from the writings of the ancient heretics, especially the Gnostics Basilides, Valentinus, &c., whose *ipsissima verba* the other fathers, amidst the boundless liberality of their abuse, have always dealt out with such a provokingly niggard hand. No fewer than fifteen lost works of this kind have been laid under pretty free contribution. Some of these fragments the Chevalier thinks (and we are quite disposed to agree with him) carry us back to the very days of the apostles. Amongst them are several taken from a work entitled the 'Great Announcement,' which Hippolytus cites as having been written by no other than Simon Magus! The Chevalier does not believe that Simon himself penned this curious production, because he thinks that it alludes to the fourth Gospel, which was not written till the last decade of the first century, whereas the uniform tradition is

that the apostles Peter and Paul outlived Simon, who, accordingly, must have died before A.D. 65. He thinks, however, that it was probably written by a personal disciple of the Samaritan impostor, and names Menander as the most likely author. For ourselves we doubt altogether the reference to St. John's Gospel, and would call the Chevalier's attention to the fact, that Hippolytus does not follow the general tradition about Simon, but makes him survive some time his alleged encounter with the apostles at Rome (p. 176), and remove thence to some other country, which, according to the vestiges in the manuscript, which is here defective (reading ἐλθὼν ἐν τ τη), appears to have been Crete. The new version here given of the story of his exit—viz., that in a fit of polemical bravado, which cost him his life, he suffered himself to be buried alive by his disciples, pretending that he should rise again the third day, most likely sprang out of the old tradition which placed the tomb of Zeus in that island. It is well known Simon assumed the name and attributes of the father of gods and men. On the whole, we see no good reason for calling in question the statement of Hippolytus, that Simon wrote the 'Great Announcement.' On the other hand, the Chevalier has been too hasty in assuming that all the heretical extracts given by Hippolytus in the article on the Simonians are taken from that work. For in one of them Simon is twice cited, (pp. 167, 168; compare p. 89,) once by name, and the second time by an express reference to the 'Great Announcement.' The extract in which this occurs, and probably others also, must have been excerpted from some production of one of his disciples: probably enough, Menander.

The critical examination pursued throughout this Second Letter is very ably conducted; and, apart from its bearing upon the question of authorship, deserves the attentive perusal of all who require a guide to the contents of the work of Hippolytus.

It places, alas! beyond doubt the extensive mutilation of even the seven books and a half, which are all that remain of the original ten, as well as the sadly impure state of the ignorant copyist's text. We have noticed some few errors into which the Chevalier has inadvertently been betrayed. For example: in settling the age of Theodotus the Banker, the father of the Melchisedekite heretics, he should not have said that 'he lived certainly not long after the year 150.' (p. 97.) For his *teacher*, the other Theodotus, styled the Currier, is expressly stated by the contemporary author of the 'Little Labyrinth' (apud Euseb. H. E. v. 28), to have been excommunicated from the Roman church by Victor, who was not bishop till forty years after that date. This condemnation concerned the

heretic's *person*, not merely 'his doctrine' as the Chevalier phrases it; much less the doctrine of his namesake and disciple the Banker: which is another inaccuracy. Hence, since the Currier himself was a recognised member of the Roman church so late as the last decade of the second century, his scholar, the Banker, cannot have broached his *derivative* heresy till at least some time afterwards. That Hippolytus speaks of the two Theodoti next to the Ebionites, is owing to the agreement of all the three heresies in the denial of our Lord's divinity. It is an instance of the *genetic* arrangement, which, as the Chevalier has himself so well shown, Hippolytus often follows in preference to the strictly chronological. To suppose otherwise would be to charge him with palpable self-contradiction, at least, on the highly probable hypothesis of his accomplished commentator, that the 'Little Labyrinth' was written by himself. As for the title cited from the 'Hypotyposes' of Clement of Alexandria, 'Extracts from Theodotus and from the so-called Oriental school, *about the time of Valentinus*,' it by no means proves that Theodotus was a contemporary of Valentinus (*floruit* 140), even granting, what is exceedingly doubtful, that the title proceeded from Clement's own pen. The leaders of the Oriental school were, as we now first learn from Hippolytus, Bardesanes, and Axionicus, who were younger contemporaries and disciples of Valentinus, which is all that the title affirms. Of Theodotus it says no such thing. If it did, the inference would be that we have here a *third* Theodotus, as several well-meaning critics, through a misunderstanding of the title, have actually concluded. But for such a hypothesis there is no necessity whatever, and we are glad to see that the Chevalier shows this conceit no more favour than the ingenious processes by which three Hippolytuses have been made out of one. We could wish, however, that he had conclusively shown to which of the two Theodoti the Clementine 'Extracts' belong. We understand him to attribute them to the Banker, but we have searched in vain for proof.

The Third Letter is much more brief and of more general interest. It gives a picture of 'The Government and Condition of the Church of Rome under Zephyrinus and Callistus, (199—222,) according to St. Hippolytus, member of the Roman Presbytery and bishop of Portus.' We extract for the benefit of our readers the following passage, which, it must be remembered, immediately follows the account already given of the rise of Callistus to the chief seat in the synagogue, thus completing the summary of the new and interesting particulars

relative to this church now first divulged to a wondering and grateful world.

'Noetus' sect was already spreading in Rome. Sabellius was a rising man, and began his speculations. Hippolytus gives us clearly to understand that, backed by others of the presbytery, he had already remonstrated against some of Sabellius' speculations on the Trinity, in the time of Zephyrinus. "Now," he adds, (p. 285,) "Sabellius was softened by these our remonstrances; but when he was alone with Callistus" (who then protected and favoured the Noetian Theological College established at Rome, at that time presided over by Cleomenes, the disciple of Noetus' ancient deacon or minister), 'Callistus excited him to turn towards the system of Cleomenes, pretending that they agreed. He did not, however, side openly with Sabellius, but in private told each party that he was favourable to their views, setting them as much as he could against each other. Now Sabellius, says Hippolytus, did not at that time see through the roguery of Callistus; but he afterwards knew it.

'For when Callistus had been made Bishop of Rome he threw off Sabellius as not orthodox. "He did so," continues Hippolytus, "because he was afraid of me, and thought he might in this manner wash off the accusation which lay against him before the church, showing himself not to be heterodox. But now the question arose how he could set himself right with Hippolytus and his party. For they, under Zephyrinus, had resisted Sabellius, then favoured by the episcopal influence; and Callistus, having at that time the bishop and most of the presbyters with him (p. 285) had insulted Hippolytus and his friends by saying to them, in the open presbytery, 'You are ditheists.'" Now Callistus, says Hippolytus, thought he must make good those insulting words; and, therefore, instead of giving honour to the truth and saying, "As Sabellius is wrong, you are right," he gave the Noetian heresy that turn, the formula of which I have placed opposite to that of Noetus (or Cleomenes) himself. He established a school in which that doctrine was taught, as Hippolytus says, in opposition to the church. "But he did worse as to practical Christianity," adds our father. To the satisfaction of a great many who for misconduct had been removed from the communion of the church and now flocked to that school, he set up the doctrine "that he forgave the sins of all." In order to screen himself, he further laid down the principle, "If a bishop commits a sin, be it even a sin unto death, he must not be deposed (or obliged to abdicate) for all that."

'This was a bold measure. For at that time, although the congregational rights of the laity had been suppressed, except in their sanction to the election of a bishop, the presbytery still claimed, and more or less maintained, a supreme judicial power in matters of faith and discipline.

'Now, what was the consequence? Bishops, presbyters, and deacons were received into orders, after having been married twice, or even thrice. Even he who married, when already in orders, might do so

undisturbed. "Did not our Saviour say, Let the tares grow with the wheat? Were there not unclean beasts in the Ark? Such, therefore, must also be in the Church." These and like scriptural arguments were brought forward by Callistus. No wonder his party increased wonderfully. He particularly favoured single ladies of rank, who wished to have a substitute for a husband in the humble form of a slave, or of a low-born freeman, and who might prefer having no children, so as not to displease their relations: for these would not be so severe if their large property remained in the family. In short, Callistus must have preached, according to Hippolytus, something like Molière's Tartuffe:

"Il y a avec le ciel des accommodemens."

—Vol. i. pp. 131—134.

The Fourth Letter examines the formal confession of faith with which Hippolytus appropriately winds up his 'Refutation.' Owing to the defective state of the manuscript, its conclusion is unfortunately wanting. But by a signally happy conjecture the Chevalier has made good the loss by appending to it the two stray chapters which, having lost their own home, have had the good taste to find their way into that noblest of all uninspired Christian writings, the Letter to Diognetus. That they had no business there has long been seen by the learned, and is attested by a marginal note in the MSS. of the Letter; and that they have the blood of Hippolytus in them the Chevalier has now clearly shown. He has accordingly restored the foundlings to their true parent. Of the character of the confession itself we cannot pause to say more than that it seems to us to embody as much both of divine truth and of human error as the views of the average run of the fathers of the same century. Its omission of any mention of the Fall, and the prominence it gives to what, by a pardonable strain upon language, may be termed the pantheistic side of Christianity (by which we mean that God is immanent *in*, as well as infinitely exalted *above*, the world), may probably be accounted for by the circumstance of its being addressed exclusively to pagans. Somewhat similar phenomena meet us in Paul's speech at Athens.

The story of Hippolytus's life, to which the work now passes, is best told by himself in that spirited Socratic Apology which the Chevalier has put into his mouth, as supposed to be delivered before a company of friends in London on the Ides of August, 1851. In the concluding Letter the details are elaborately argued, and a world of learned dust, in which poor Hippolytus has heretofore been *perdu*, is happily laid by the sprinkling of a few drops fresh from the fountain of truth. But in the speech the man himself stands forth still more

vividly before us, clothed in flesh and blood. Our readers will much prefer to hear the old bishop's own tale. It will be seen that he repudiates, *sans ceremonie*, La Moyne's unfortunate conjecture, which Cave thought was all that was certainly known about Hippolytus, and which led even Neander astray—viz., that the Portus Romanus, in Arabia, the present Aden, was the scene of his pastoral labours:—

‘I know nothing of that Roman port which they say existed in Arabia, and whither they want to send me into exile. But I know Portus, the harbour, as it were, the Piræus, of Rome. You are all acquainted with Ostia, the ancient mouth of the Tiber; and many among you, I dare say, have visited the Holy Island, with its shore of little more than two miles in length from one outlet of the muddy river to the other. Indeed, it is from you I have learned how that same island, in my time covered with roses and called a paradise, and crowded by the almost adjoining buildings of Ostia and of Portus, is now a barren spot, haunted by wild buffaloes, and used as a place of transportation, like Sardinia of old. As to Portus itself, they tell me the place bears the old name, but is now no more a harbour; there is yet a pond, I hear, with a few huts round it, constructed, as well as the house of the bishop, which they style a palace, from the ruins of temples and theatres, quays and piers, which place they call Porto, meaning Portus. But I know old Portus. I recollect that on the natural outlet at Ostia having become shallow and impracticable for shipping, one of our early emperors, I forget whether Claudius or Trajan, cut a canal of some miles above, which took in a part of the water of the river, and conducted it to a deep and costly basin, surrounded by warehouses, and open to the sea. A flourishing borough had in consequence risen round this new port; and the place, called Portus, became very populous. All ships came there; and all the nations who traded with Rome had their warehouses and their club-houses and their sanctuaries at Portus. Being by origin a Greek, speaking Greek as my native tongue, and having studied under Irenæus, who taught in Greek, I was considered by the presbytery at Rome and the congregation at Portus to be a proper person to go thither, in spite of the neighbourhood of the city of Ostia. For Greek was the medium not only of common conversation at the Harbour, but also of religious controversy and of worship. I became instrumental there in doing good. The foreigners liked me; and I was called the Bishop of the Nations. Indeed, I preferred living and conversing with any of them to disputing and living with the Jews. I was a bishop, with the same right as the bishop of Ostia, my neighbour and brother, whose title was older, and who took precedence of me in the presbytery at Rome, but who had little to inspect and to govern, whereas I was really the bishop of the foreigners coming to Rome. By becoming the rector, and therefore the bishop of the Harbour, I did not cease to be a presbyter at Rome, our metropolis, with which we were all connected. Why should I not be both at the same time?

'As to my domestic life, it was certainly very unlike what I have seen the successor of Irenæus* lead at Lugdunum. I had no court around me; but I had a wife and children, the very mention of which startled that priest, and those about him whom he called canons. But you, feeling so blessed in your homes, and leading, as far as I can see, very generally, clergy as well as laity, a happy family life, will sympathize with me in what I am going to tell you on this subject.†

'It was at Portus that I married; and there I lost my ever beloved and only wife, Chloe, the faithful and zealous assistant in what I may call not only my parochial, but my missionary labours in that noisy port. Her memory is for ever connected with that place. Probably my biographers have not told you, that she was the sister of that rich and influential man, Heron, for a long time my opponent and my rival, as sacristan and fanatical patron of the gaudy and deceitful temple of Serapis at Portus, near the Egyptian warehouse. Let me, at all events, tell you with humble thankfulness, my labours were at length crowned with success, so that I became instrumental in converting him to the saving faith of Christ. These were the happiest days of my life. But, alas! in the next summer I lost Chloe, in consequence of a fatal fever. My own health having suffered much, I was prevailed upon to reside at Rome. There my bitter controversies began; and my domestic bereavement became complete. In the month of August, in the following year, I had to weep over the corpse of my beloved son Anteros. He also became a victim of the fever, having caught it in Bishop Callistus's house, in the Jews' quarter, on the other side of the Tiber, near the old bridge, whither I had sent him with a message connected with our angry discussions and disputes. Thus much about myself. You know me now personally.'—Vol. iv. pp. 24—27.

It is the uniform tradition that Hippolytus sealed his faith with his blood. The Chevalier proves that this must have taken place about A.D. 236, under Maximin the Thracian. In a still extant poem, written about a century and a half afterwards, Prudentius describes the scene of his martyrdom as he saw it depicted upon the walls of a chapel erected to his memory near Rome. Moreover, some fifty years before the poet sang his triumphant death, the art of the sculptor was called into requisition to commemorate his useful life. A statue was erected in his honour on the same spot of which Prudentius speaks, and there, wonderful to relate, it was actually discovered just three hundred years ago. A classical engraving of this unique work of Christian art appropriately

* The Cardinal de Bonald, the present Archbishop of Lyons, with whom Hippolytus is supposed, according to the fiction, to have come into contact previous to his arrival in England.

† The reader scarcely needs to be informed that the pleasant gossip now to be given, about the family of Hippolytus, belongs to the garniture of the story.

forms the frontispiece of the Chevalier's work. On the sides of the *cathedra* on which Hippolytus is represented sitting, his Paschal Cycle, and the titles of most of his writings are engraved. From this monument, compared with the similar lists furnished by Eusebius, Jerome, and Nicephorus, a pretty lengthy catalogue of his literary productions has been carefully compiled by the zealous resuscitator of his fame, who has also scrupulously indicated what pieces are still extant, even to the minutest fragments. Having thus paved the way for the new edition of the works of this early father, which must soon be loudly called for, the 'Critical Enquiry' and the first volume of 'Hippolytus and his Age,' are brought to a close together.

The cue being thus taken from Hippolytus as a leading ecclesiastical personage, who lived in the middle of the post-apostolic portion of the Ante-Nicene times, the remainder of the work aims to delineate the Christian school, congregation, worship, and life of those primitive times, and to hold the picture up as a mirror to our own. The second volume lays down, as the speculative groundwork of the whole design, a series of profound 'Aphorisms on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind, and in particular on the History of Religion;' whilst certain 'Fragments on the Life and Consciousness of the Ancient Church and of the Age of Hippolytus in particular,' constitute its historical basis. To this latter section of the 'Philosophical Research,' two valuable appendices are subjoined—viz., 1. On the Christian Sacrifice, giving the leading passages in Irenæus relating to that subject; 2. On the Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles. This second appendix is quite *à propos* of Hippolytus, whose statue enumerates amongst his works one on 'The Apostolic Tradition concerning Spiritual Gifts' (χαρισμάτων), which is almost the exact title of the former half of the eighth book of the Greek Constitutions in the Oxford and Vienna MSS., where, moreover, Hippolytus is expressly named as the channel of transmission. This luminous piece of criticism forms, besides, a necessary supplement to the 'Historical Fragments,' and an indispensable introduction to the 'Church and House Book of the Ancient Christians,' the reconstruction, interpretation, and application of which make up the third volume. Now, for the first time, by a critical comparison of the Syriac, Abyssinian, Arabic, and Coptic Constitutions with the Greek, has a sifting been effected of the earlier from the later elements in these really very interesting though pretentious collections. At last a tolerably safe road has been thrown across this Serbonian bog of ancient ecclesiastical literature, and many a future student will have to thank

the enterprising scholar, who has combined the genius of a Stephenson with the drudgery of a 'navvy,' to render passable to succeeding pilgrims this terrible Slough of Despond. The following are the results at which the Chevalier has arrived:—

'*First.*—The Greek text contains three distinct collections: the first six books, the seventh, and the eighth.

'*Second.*—The first of these collections (Books I.—VI.) is entirely rewritten, and then interpolated.

'*Third.*—The interpolations, here and in the other collections, betray themselves in most cases, not only by their contents, but also by the fact, that when they are expunged, a natural order appears in the arrangement of the ordinances, instead of the present entire want of any logical order.

'*Fourth.*—The second Greek collection, or the seventh book, is in its ordinances, entirely original, and is not reproduced in the other, not Greek, collections.

'*Fifth.*—The vulgar text of the eighth book of the Greek Constitutions is a corrupt and interpolated recension of the text exhibited in the Vienna and Oxford manuscripts: exactly as Grabe had maintained.

'*Sixth.*—This compilation is connected with Hippolytus, both by the Introduction, with which it opens, and which may be considered as substantially representing part of the lost book of Hippolytus, the "Apostolic Tradition respecting the Gifts of the Holy Spirit," and by the wording of the chapters on the Offices of the Church, and, perhaps, by that of others (Books III.—VI.)

'*Seventh.*—The principal materials of this compilation are contained in the latter portion of the collection of Apostolical Ordinances used in Egypt (Books III.—VI.), and preserved to us in the Coptic text.

'*Eighth.*—The first portion of these Ordinances (Books I., II.) of the Church of Alexandria represents the groundwork of something very like that which the first six books of the Greek Constitutions, a decidedly fraudulent imposture, the forerunner of the Pseudo-Isidorian imposture of the later canon law of the Church of Rome, exhibit in a thoroughly corrupted and comparatively worthless text.

'*Ninth.*—The other collection of the Church of Alexandria, now only preserved in the Abyssinian text, and its Arabic translation, bears the same primitive character in its original elements, and represents, in the chapter on the admission of Catechumens, parts of the eighth book of our Greek Constitutions.

'*Tenth.*—The Syrian collection, or the collection of ordinances as used in the Church of Antioch and its allied Churches of the Syrian tongue, bears a similar relation to other parts of the eighth book of our Greek Constitutions; but does not coincide with either of the Alexandrian collections.'—Vol. ii. pp. 252—254.

Out of the large mass of materials furnished by these multifarious collections, the Chevalier has compiled, with consummate judgment and critical tact, that 'Church and House

Book of the Ancient Christians' already mentioned, in which the interest of the work fairly culminates. To this authentic autobiography of Ante-Nicene Christianity, the two preceding volumes looked forward; to elucidate it, and to ply our own age with its lessons is the design of the remainder of the third; and to supplement it with some account of the theological thinking, and of the service-books of the early church, is the aim of the sprightly Apology of Hippolytus, and of the *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ*, with its general introduction, which form the contents of the fourth. It is important to keep our eye on this, the beating heart of the whole, since otherwise the work will appear a good deal tangled and disjointed. But from this point of view, as will be seen from the analysis we have now slightly sketched, all appears tolerably in order. Having, therefore, climbed this vantage-ground, we rest, and invite our readers to enjoy with us the prospect which here opens before us. We do not recommend those who may procure the work to harass themselves with any critical scruples such as might now and then intrude, but would rather have them trustingly follow the finger of our enthusiastic guide, open their eyes to the sunny scene, bear with his moralizings, and learn what he has to teach. If any particular feature is an eyesore to us, we will remember that after all it is not the normal church of *our* hearts that he professes to show us, but one of a later, though still of a very early age. Nonconformists as we are, let us, as a brother poet has so truthfully pictured Milton standing before the Gothic cathedral—

‘With antique pillars, massy roof,
And storied windows richly dight,
Casting a dim, religious light’—

repel the carpings of any hypercritical Puritan at our elbow with the calm reiteration of our opinion, ‘Still it is *beautiful!*’ We will ourselves make a clean breast of it, and frankly own, that we have been at times not a little smitten with the vision, and, farther, that it has been less by reading our dissenting journals than by turning back to the Acts of the Apostles, that we have succeeded in breaking the spell. It will, at least, do our modesty no harm to imagine it just possible that our own age has its blemishes as well as that of Hippolytus, and that his may have realized truths and practised virtues, which we have never learned or have forgotten. Besides, there are some who have dared to fancy that our present religious and ecclesiastical *status quo* is neither adapted nor destined to bear the strain of time and circumstances many centuries longer; nay, some who think they hear already the ominous sighing of the storm, and who fear that we shall founder, if we do not keep a good look-out *astern* as well as

ahead. Of these the Chevalier is one. Let us hear his solemn convictions (of whose truth he says he has no more doubt than he has of his own existence) as to the nature and the work of the times we live in:—

‘The question,’ he says, ‘at this moment is not how to carry out, but how to prepare, a second, grand, reconstructive Reformation. The porch of the temple must first be more thoroughly cleansed than it was in the sixteenth, and, above all, restored more honestly than it was in the seventeenth century; and, lastly, the work must be handled more practically than has yet been done by the critical German school of this age. In the meantime, let everyone cleanse his own heart and house as well as he can. When the feeling of the misery which is coming, and a real faith in the saving truth which is in Christ, shall have thoroughly penetrated the nations, then will the Spirit of God assuredly come upon them with might, either for the reformation or the annihilation of the existing churches. Whether this crisis will end in the renewal or in the destruction of the present nations and states, will depend upon the position which they take in face of the demands of the Gospel, and the wants of the times. For every nation and age has its time and its day of visitation, after which its fate is sealed.’—Vol. iii. p. xxxvii.

If such be, indeed, the momentous problem and the alarming responsibilities of our age, we can ill afford to be heedless of the Pharos of history. Rather let us look and learn.—We arrange our very brief recapitulations and extracts according to the order observed in the ‘Church and House Book.’

I. *The Christian School and the Baptismal Pledge.*—The neutrality of this review on the Baptist controversy, prevents our quotation of several passages on that subject. We merely observe that the Chevalier treats the question with great freedom and in a manner which, while it will certainly be quite pleasing to neither of the parties at issue, may perhaps be profitable to both. Those of our readers who wish to learn the views which are broached, will apply to the volumes themselves.

II. *The Constitution and Government of the Christian Church.*—In the time of Hippolytus, each town was an independent bishopric and church with organic congregational life, just as Baxter and Clarkson maintained. Wherever there were twelve Christian families, they might demand a bishop from the neighbouring churches, which, accordingly, sent bishops and presbyters to examine the candidate as to his possession of the qualifications required by the apostle with a view to his ordination. Married men were eligible. The people were to say of the candidate, ‘We choose him;’ and to ratify their choice by a solemn vote. The church then prayed over him, ‘O God, show Thy love to this man whom Thou hast prepared for us!’ and at least one bishop and one presbyter laid their hands upon him. The newly ordained bishop then celebrated the communion. As the church expanded,

presbyters, generally two or three, were chosen by the people, and ordained just as the bishop, but by him alone; and these were equal to him in all respects, save the occupancy of the chair, and the power of ordination within the church. Deacons, male and female, for the care of the sick and poor, were elected in like manner, and received imposition of hands from the bishop. Sometimes there were formed beyond the single congregation larger church unions; *e. g.*, Hippolytus himself, and doubtless also the bishops of other towns adjacent to the capital, belonged to the Roman presbytery. The principal cities formed central points for the province or island, as mother towns. There the bishops assembled in synod under the presidency of the first bishop either in age or importance, although any believer might attend their sittings as a hearer. On the subject of these larger church unions, the Chevalier makes the following acute remarks:—

‘This second stage in the development of the church’s constitution is therefore already affected with the decay of the times. There were no longer, then, any real nations, but only municipal unions. The ancient world did not know a free nation beyond the municipal limits, and therefore had no representative government. Christianity prepared this by clerical senates and synods; it could not create nations. The congregation was free, and her life the only living and free life of the age. But this free element in the Christian community remains within the narrow limits of the municipal constitution; all beyond that is unfree, as regards the congregations. Independent and autonomic in their parochial concerns, the congregations are excluded from the general church affairs. But it is these precisely which became every day of more and more importance. In proportion as the relations grew more complicated, and the differences upon points of doctrine more serious, and in proportion as more stress was laid upon doctrinal forms, as symbols of the church, and conditions of church communion, its government and destinies fell more and more into the hands of the bishop.’—Vol. iii. p. 225.

III. *The Christian Sacrifice and the Liturgy and Order of Service.*—If the word ‘sacrifice’ somewhat jars upon the protestant nerves of our readers, as it is supposed to have done upon those of some of the select London audience before whom Hippolytus delivered his Apology, we are sure they will do him the justice to hear a paragraph or two of his spirited explanation. Any forebodings they may have harboured of his being a Tridentine divine will thus be effectually dispelled, even if they should still be a little puzzled to say under what category of reformed theologians the bishop of Portus should be classed:—

‘The most sober way of stating our view historically would be some-

thing like this: There are in truth only two real sacrifices in the world's history, the sacrifice of the historical Christ offered through a life of holiest action and a death of purest love, and the sacrifice of the church, that is to say of faithful humanity in the succession of generations, offering up itself in childlike thankfulness through life and death, and expressing this as the Christian vow in the act of common adoration. Now, as the one sacrifice, the sacrifice of atonement, which the nations before Christ, disturbed in their consciences by sin, and by their consequent estrangement from God, and not initiated in the mystery of eternal love, had vainly and madly endeavoured to achieve, was accomplished by Christ; so the other, which neither could they accomplish, not having in them the feeling of children of the all-loving Father, is in the way of accomplishment, as the great sacrifice of thanksgiving, or of thankful self-devotion, during the course of ages. It is the sign of the growth of the mystical (that is to say spiritual) body of Christ, of the advancement of the kingdom of God upon earth, of the ever-continuing incorporation of mankind in God. The church, in the spiritual and intellectual sense of the word, more or less imperfectly represented by the congregations of the faithful, is both the sacrificing priest and the victim offered up. For she is the ideal sacrificer, the acting person, acting by the spirit of Christ in her; and by her reality, and by all the individuals worshipping together and making the common vow with individual responsibility, she is equally the object offered up.

'But if all this be certain (and it is certain), however differently expressed, we the fathers, having enacted and tried this sacrifice, and knowing by experience that it was, and ever must be, the centre of Christian religion, in life and in worship, might well be tempted to use the most symbolical phrases in speaking of this mystery of humanity uniting itself to divinity. . . . Only one thing is as impossible as that the spirit of God should not be the spirit of truth; the organs of the life of the ancient church could never think of the Church offering up Christ, who suffered death upon the cross. This would in her eyes have been an absurdity, a contradiction, and a blasphemy. She in Christ, through his spirit, offered up herself; this was and is, and (mark that well) this ever will be the reality, the great reality, of all life, all history, and all religion.'—Vol. iv. p. 91.

The written Liturgies which the Chevalier thinks were extant in the days of Hippolytus, and even earlier, he believes to have been designed to furnish *models*, rather than prescribed *forms*, of prayer; here again falling in with the view taken by our own learned Clarkson of the most ancient of these compositions. Such a Directory for the Communion Service he professes to have restored, as used in the Church of Alexandria about the middle of the second century. Let us yield for a moment to the illusion (if such it be), and, entering the old Hall of Prayer, styled the Baucalis, in that city, situate between the Necropolis Gate and the New Canal, and said to have been set

apart by St. Mark, let us watch the Christian worship as conducted by the bishop Celadion. The congregation, consisting, at the commencement, both of catechumens and believers, is assembled in the centre and side aisles, the men and the women apart. The presbyters and deacons, with Celadion as president, occupy the semicircular recess at the further end of the building. The stout communion table, made to groan beneath the heaped-up gifts of the Christian people, including the bread and wine for the sacrament, stands as the connecting link between the flock and its shepherds. The service opens with psalmody, sung in the antiphonic or responsive manner; or else with an act of confession and humiliation, followed by a canticle. Then lessons are read both from the Old and New Testament, upon which is founded the short expository sermon. This finished, the catechumens are dismissed with a blessing. Upon their withdrawal the believers express their brotherhood by saluting each other with the kiss of peace; the men the men, and the women the women; and those in front of and those behind the table simultaneously advance towards it. The communion service is then led off by Celadion, according to a liturgy (vol. iv. p. 161 sq.) which, whether so ancient or not, must be allowed to be a perfect gem for apostolic simplicity and beauty. Our limited space prevents our quoting it, and we must therefore be content to recommend our readers to indulge themselves with its early perusal.

IV. *The Rules of Christian Life in the Congregational, Social, and Domestic Relations.*—We can touch but one or two salient points. The Christian sacrifice, which formed the focus of the worship of the early church, would have been but a solemn mockery, had she neglected to realize it in her life. But her regulations on this head bear witness to no such remissness. A high moral earnestness breathes through them all, and she could hardly have decked for the altar so many hecatombs of martyrs had not her bracing discipline been pretty rigorously enforced.

The feeling of brotherhood in Christ, which, like the sweet breath of spring, had thawed men's original selfishness in the Pentecostal community at Jerusalem, was still alive in the believers. The congregation was the extended family, and its members brothers and sisters. From the numerous ordinances on the subject in the 'Church and House Book,' we gather, that scarcely a day could have passed without an Agape's being held, either in the Hall of Prayer or in some private house, so that we seem to be witnessing the daily round of entertainments given to one another and to their three sisters by the sons of the Patriarch of Uz. At these feasts of love there were no meats

offered to idols to ensnare the conscience; no lascivious songs or dances, such as defiled the common *Syssitiæ*. The bishop was never expected to fast except when the whole church did so on some special occasion, and the reason given for his exemption from the more private mortifications to which others subjected themselves is, that he may always be at liberty for any Agape given by a brother. As a rule, he was present at all such gatherings, and led the conversation, in which rich and poor mingled with hallowed freedom. How important an influence must have been exerted by these frequent Christian parties in weaning the guests from those idolatrous customs which had eaten like a fretting leprosy into the whole framework of society, as well as in cementing their fellowship with Christ and with one another, is obvious at a glance. In most churches, moreover, there was daily worship and communion before the members went to their work. The Saturday and the Sunday were especially devoted to religious exercises. The same days, as well as a fortnight at Easter, were holidays for all slaves whose masters were Christians, that they might have leisure for the church, and 'be taught piety in the service of God.' Well may the Chevalier exclaim, in reference to this humane regulation: 'What an attack upon the kingdom of insatiable Mammon!'

In like manner woman was befriended. The sanctity of marriage was unflinchingly upheld in an age of universal concubinage. This reform was the key-stone of the Christian moral revolution, the lever which lifted the social world. The two first and mightiest of the Cæsars had ignominiously failed in all their legislative efforts to restore the dignity of the ancient Roman marriage, but Christianity solved the problem in an infinitely higher sense than was even attempted by them. 'The Christian woman was looked upon in a very different light to the Jewess and the heathen. She was honoured as a coheirress of the kingdom of heaven, as sharing the same responsibilities and the same hopes. And the woman made ample return to Christianity for what Christianity did for her. In the higher as well as lower classes, it was woman who made most of the converts to the religion of mankind, and during persecution displayed the courage of the hero with the discipline of the virgin.' (Vol. iii. p. 358.)

We now close these remarkable volumes with a lively feeling of gratitude for so rich an offering to the cause of the Second Reformation; in his devout and ardent longings for which there are many noble hearts beating in unison with the author's. We have understood that by some obscure clergymen, Puseyite and evangelical, he has been slandered as an infidel, just as

the starched Byzantine patriarch, Photius, mistook a work of the pious Hippolytus for the production of a Jew. It is not difficult to comprehend how his marvellous freedom of thought and speech, that *παρρησία* which characterizes him in common with all reformers and apostles, should stir up some to honour with their abuse one too great to be ignored. Nor are his opinions, in truth, always such as square with the notions of the strictest sect of English orthodoxy. His book is still to be judged as the work of a German, albeit written and published first in our own language, and that, too, in a style which displays a mastery both of its inmost spirit and its power of expression such as few natives attain. We regard his long residence amongst us, and especially this brilliant descent into the arena of English theological literature, as a happy presage of that fruitful union between the Greek spirit of speculation so rife in his fatherland and the Roman realism of our own, from whose future consummation he rightly augurs such a progeny of blessings to the world. In this respect, Hippolytus, whose statue with the Roman toga slung over the Greek pallium well illustrates the position which his Hellenic descent and his Italian associations secured to him, in his day, as the connecting link between the Eastern and the Western Christianity, is no bad type of the anglicised German to whom he will owe so much of his future fame. It was a true instinct which led the Chevalier to pitch upon so congenial a subject. No wonder that he has handled it *con amore*, and with such signal success.

ART. II.—*Life of the Rev. William Kirby, M.A., F.R.S., F.L.S., &c., Rector of Barham.* By John Freeman, M.A., Rural Dean, Rector of Ashwicken, Norfolk. London: Longman, Brown, and Co. 1852.

NIHIL PER SALTUM was the motto of the illustrious Linnæus, when treating of the advance which Nature makes from one form of being to another. The progress of natural history, on the contrary, has been largely *per saltum*, having been in a great measure dependent on the genius or industry of isolated individuals, whose names stand out as prominent landmarks, when we gaze backward, and essay to trace the history of science. The eras of Aristotle, of Ray, of Linnæus, of Buffon, of Cuvier, are as broadly marked in scientific history as those of Cæsar, of Columbus, and of Napoleon, in that of nations. The revolutions which constituted them *eras*, were in each case

the results, not of gradual change, but of the influence exercised by a master-mind over all his fellows, displacing theories to which universal consent had given the force of laws, and suddenly commanding public recognition of a standard of thought and action hitherto unknown. The name of the venerable man, whose 'Life' is now before us, will ever be had in honour by the lovers of his favourite science, as having given an impetus to its progress which will be long felt.

After the death-like torpor in which all natural history slept from the age of Pliny to the revival of learning in the sixteenth century, the first work of any note that treated of entomology exclusively was published in England. It was the '*Theatrum Insectorum*' of Mouffet, illustrated with five hundred wood-engravings, rude and coarse enough, to be sure, yet vigorous, and for the most part easily recognisable, and calculated to extend the desire of becoming acquainted with the 'minims of existence;' especially when the pages of this elaborate work were unsealed a few years after to the vulgar, by being translated into English. This was performed by Edward Topsel, curate of St. Botolph's, London; and it argues somewhat for the prevalence of the study of entomology at this early period, that two editions of such a work, the one in Latin, the other in English, were published within five and twenty years,—the former having appeared in 1634, the latter in 1658. The history of this work is somewhat curious: it was commenced by Dr. Edward Wotton, and Conrad Gesner, both names of note in science; it was carried on by Dr. Thomas Penny, an eminent physician and botanist, who employed the leisure of fifteen years in collecting details, and in making figures of species. On his death, in 1589, the voluminous MSS. were purchased by Mouffet, who remodelled the whole, improved the style, and added one hundred and fifty more figures. He, however, died before the completion of the work, which then lay in obscurity until it fell into the hands of Sir Theodore Mayerne, who at length presented it to the public in the year 1634, the result of more than half a century's labour and research.

It was exactly a century afterwards—viz., in 1758, that the English public were made acquainted with the observations* of one who even at this day stands unrivalled in his peculiar walk in science, John Swammerdam. He was the father of anatomical research applied to the more minute animals, on which he used with unexampled success the powers of the then recently invented microscope. His last work, '*The Anatomy*

* The Book of Nature; or, The History of Insects, originally published in 1669.

of the Ephemera,' was the result of more than ten years' laborious study. Like the subject of the memoir before us, Swammerdam was a man of great amiableness and true piety; and like him, he gave special attention to those interesting and useful insects, *the bees*, his treatise on the history of which, Boerhaave eulogizes as 'a work which all the ages from the commencement of natural history have produced nothing to equal, nothing to compare with.'

As Swammerdam was the first dissector of insects, our countrymen, Ray and Willughby, stand at the head of systematic classification, if indeed their contemporary and compatriot, Lister, be not allowed to share this honour with them. The treatise of the last-named naturalist on the British Spiders is even now cited as of the highest authority; he has arranged them under greater and less divisions, and has affixed to each species a short and expressive technical definition, which precedes a more full description. This work appeared in 1678.

Ray's is a great name in natural history. In botany he was the founder of the 'natural system,' which, though in advance of the age, and for a while eclipsed by the more showy and more readily available 'artificial' arrangement of Linnæus and his disciples, has at length succeeded in obtaining universal favour among botanists. Many of his fundamental divisions, and most of his principles of arrangement, have been adopted by Jussieu, Brown, Decandolle, and Lindley,—the names of greatest weight in modern botany.

As a zoologist, Ray ranks nearly as high; Cuvier declares his works to be 'the foundation of modern zoology, since naturalists are obliged to consult them every instant for the purpose of clearing up the difficulties which they meet with in the works of Linnæus and his copyists.' His 'History of Insects,' part of which had been prepared by Willughby, is remarkable for the numerous and accurate descriptions with which it is filled, and for its precise and clear method of classification. The theory of spontaneous generation, which had up to his day been a *quæstio vexata* among naturalists, he decisively rejected. It is pleasant to know and pleasant to record that Ray also was not only a man of unblemished life, but one who delighted to render his studies of God's works subservient to the praise of Him 'for whose pleasure they are, and were created.'

The study of the science was meanwhile deriving great aid from the artistic talent bestowed upon the delineation of species. Early in the seventeenth century the introduction of insects into pictures and embroidery began to be fashionable, and eminent artists and court painters disdained not to employ

their powers on such subjects. The names of Hoefnagle, Robert, Aubriet, and Robin; of Merian, Schwertz, Goedart, Albin, Roesel, Lyonnet, and many others, occur as examples in point, each of whom brought pictorial talents to bear upon the illustration of entomology.

The formation of private museums and cabinets by wealthy individuals contributed also to advance the science, by affording facilities for comparison and study of specimens. Large fortunes were frequently expended by their enthusiastic possessors in the accumulation of these collections; printed instructions on the best modes of procuring, preserving, and transmitting specimens, were copiously distributed to captains of ships, to travellers, to residents in foreign lands, and thus the productions of all parts of the world poured into the cabinets of these liberal patrons of science. The opulent apothecaries, Petiver of London, and Seba of Amsterdam, Sir Hans Sloane, the court physician, and Drury, the rich jeweller, formed collections of great extent, which they not only threw open with liberality to the scientific student, but used in the preparation of elaborate and highly illustrated works. Sloane's collection formed the nucleus of the British Museum; but we believe no remnant of his rich zoological treasury now exists. Petiver's insects are still preserved; and we remember the pleasure with which some years ago we looked upon specimens of our native butterflies, prepared by his own hands, and protected from the ravages of time by a curious, but very effective device. Each butterfly is pressed flat between two plates of glass, around the edges of which paper is pasted, so as to exclude the air.

The mighty impulse given to entomology, as to all other branches of natural history, by that northern star, Linnæus, it may be sufficient to allude to; but we cannot help mentioning the benefit conferred upon science by his most felicitous invention of the *nomen triviale*. Lister and Ray had employed a short technical definition of each species, which the latter called its *titulus*, and which Linnæus designated the *nomen specificum*; this was the title by which the species was known among naturalists, and by Linnæus's canon it was not allowed to exceed twelve words. It was, however, a cumbrous piece of machinery; and Linnæus struck out the brilliant idea of affixing a single epithet to every species so defined, which henceforward became its cognomen. Instead of 'the coccinella, with red wing-sheaths, having seven black dots,' the species in question became known as 'coccinella septempunctata,' a substitution which we may better appreciate, if we suppose that instead of indicating our friend as 'Timothy Hotchkins,' we had to describe him as 'Timothy, that wears a fustian jacket,

with seven brass buttons before and two behind.' The entomological system of this wonderful reformer was remarkably luminous, clear, and simple; it took for its basis organs of essential importance, yet easy of observation by the merest tyro—the wings; and it enhances the admiration with which we look upon his labours in this science when we learn that they were the produce of moments spent by others '*in venationibus, confabulationibus, tesseris, chartis, lusibus, computationibus.*' (Faun. Suec.; Præf.)

Natural history henceforward takes a prominent place in the literature of Europe, and entomology is by no means its least cultivated department. In France, the '*Mémoires*' of Reaumur and Bonnet gave to science the charm of a popular and elegant dress, while the curious facts elicited imparted to it all the interest of a romance. These writers, relying on careful and minute observation and patient experiment, recorded with perspicuity and grace, while they rejected the technicalities of system, may be considered the founders of the Buffonian school. In Holland, appeared Sepp's exquisitely finished plates on insects, which have never been surpassed. Lyonnet's most elaborate investigation of the anatomy of a caterpillar was also illustrated by plates, the execution of which was truly wonderful. Schaeffer on the entomology of Ratisbon, and Scopoli on that of Carniola, contributed greatly to the advance of the science. But the light still lingered in the northern sky. De Geer, in Sweden, improving on the classification of Linnæus, founded his system on the united characters of the wings and the mouth, and thus approached nearer to a natural arrangement than any of his predecessors or contemporaries. His '*Mémoires*' are full of the most valuable observations. But it was in Denmark that a master in entomology arose, to whose superior knowledge even Linnæus was fain to bow. Fabricius, a pupil of the illustrious Swede, was not content with remodelling the system of his teacher, but set himself to form a new one. Taking the parts of the mouth, the *instrumenta cibaria*, as he called them, as the sole ground of his generic characters, and selecting an entirely new nomenclature for his orders, he constructed a system which speedily attained a very high degree of popularity. Linnæus himself resigned the presidency in entomology to his eminent pupil: '*Si Dom. Fabricius,*' said he, '*venit cum aliquo insecto, et Dom. Zoega cum aliquo musco, tunc ego pileum detraho, et dico, Estote doctores mei!*'—(Stæver's Life of Linn., 186.)

In fact, the rapidity with which the insects of all countries were now pouring into the cabinets of Europe, compelled the constant formation of new genera; for those of Linnæus were found

totally inadequate to receive them ; while the immense accumulation of species possessing in common the characters which the Swedish professor had called *generic*, necessitated the subdivision of his genera, and elevated them to the rank of higher groups. The care, too, with which local *faunas* (the phrase adopted to designate the zoological productions of a particular district or country) were now examined, tended to the same result. Works aiming to enumerate and to illustrate all the species of some one country were characteristic of the close of the last century ; as were also eclectic essays on particular orders. Donovan, Jones, Lewin, Abbot, Clairville, and Marsham acquired lasting reputation in these walks of science.

The opening of the nineteenth century was distinguished by the publication of a work, which must be regarded as marking an era in entomology. It has been characterized by one* eminently qualified to form a judgment as 'the only purely scientific work on entomology that had appeared in Britain since the time of Ray ;' and by another† as 'the most valuable critical work on entomology that ever was published ;' while in all parts of the continent its *debût* was hailed with the warmest eulogy. It united the characteristics of the two descriptions of works just mentioned ; it was an essay upon a single genus, and its range was limited to a single country. It was the *MONOGRAPHIA APUM ANGLIÆ* of William Kirby.

That two octavo volumes should be devoted to the species of bees native to England, may doubtless excite surprise in many, who perhaps have never recognised any species of the genus save that well-known one which dwells in hives of straw or glass, and supplies their breakfast-tables with honey. Nor will their wonder be lessened when they learn that the industry of Mr. Kirby had discovered, and distinguished with critical acumen, no fewer than two hundred and twenty-one species of native bees. Of these, one hundred and fifty-four were found inhabiting his own parish of Barham, an area of 1573 acres.

The design which the author proposed to himself in writing this 'Monograph' was worthy of a Christian philosopher. It cannot be better expressed than in the words of one of his own letters, of which a fac-simile has been engraved by his biographer as a specimen of his hand-writing.

'December 21st, 1800. I am at this time very busy in getting a natural history work ready for the press. In this work my aim is to unite two sisters, that through the fault of the admirers of one of them have long been separated, and the consequence has been much

* Leach.

MacLeay.

mischief : I mean Religion and Natural History. The Author of Scripture is also the Author of Nature: and this visible world, by types, indeed, and by symbols, declares the same truths as the Bible does by words. To make the naturalist a religious man,—to turn his attention to the glory of God, that he may declare his works, and in the study of his creatures see the loving kindness of the Lord,—may this in some measure be the fruit of my work, and may essential Power, Wisdom, and Love, the Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, so far prosper it that it may tend to produce these effects!

The technical and critical character which the work necessarily assumed did not prevent the pious author from finding many occasions of glorifying the Almighty Architect of Nature by setting forth His most worthy praise, and of showing the harmony that must ever subsist between the works of creation and of grace, and of fervent aspiration after 'the true end of our being, the knowledge and enjoyment of Him, who is essential Power, Wisdom, and Love, through that Blessed Person, who having first created us, afterwards assumed our nature, and died for us.'

This celebrated treatise begins with a history of the order *Hymenoptera*, to which the bees belong. The attention which these insects had received from various naturalists is traced; their formation into a distinct group, with defined characters, the changes subsequently made in the limits and in the definition of the order, and the progress made up to the time of publication in acquaintance with the forms, structure, functions, distribution, instincts, and habits of its members, are all investigated with the greatest skill and acumen.

An elaborate examination of the various anatomical parts, often minute and difficult to be distinguished, that are used in the scientific nomenclature of the order, next follows. The indigenous Bees are then grouped into two great divisions, which the author considers as *genera*, and accordingly characterizes under the names of *Melitta* and *Apis*, subdividing each genus, however, into natural groups. He then proceeds to describe species; and it is a curious circumstance that in so large a number as are enumerated, the division is as equal as it could have been made, had the representatives of the respective genera, like the leaders of a cricket-match, alternately 'chosen sides,' one hundred and eleven species being assigned to the genus *Melitta*, one hundred and ten to the genus *Apis*.

It is in that part of the work which characterizes the subdivisions of the two genera that the unscientific reader will find most to interest and amuse him; for here the learned author has depicted in detail the curious instincts and manners proper to each family, which have ever made the bees the most

entertaining of insects. The curious contrivances resorted to by very many species, solitary as well as social, for the protection of their eggs and young, are especially worthy of admiration; and the variety which is found in the modes employed for the purpose, and in the situations of safety or concealment selected, would scarcely be imagined by one unacquainted with the subject. The hexagonal cells of the hive-bee (*Apis mellifica*), the secretion of the wax of which they are formed, the 'bee-bread' with which they are stored, the honey so industriously gathered, and so carefully treasured,—all have respect to the wants of the (as yet unborn) young. The humble-bees (*A. terrestris*, &c.) find or make a large chamber in the earth, in the vicinity of a mossy bank; then placing themselves in Indian file, four or five bees in a line, reaching from the moss to the hole, the foremost tears away and *cards* (so to speak) the feathery moss, and delivers it to his successor; he in turn to the next, and so in succession, until the bundle is transported to the chamber, where it is used to form a soft and warm covering for an irregular comb of silken cocoons, that represent the waxen cells of the more urbiculous hive-bees.

The carpenter-bees (*A. violacea*, &c.) bore long holes in soft wood, as truly cylindrical as if drilled with a gimlet, by means of their horny jaws. The sawdust thus obtained is then carefully employed to divide the gallery into a dozen or more chambers by transverse partitions. Each partition is thus formed; a few particles of the sawdust are mixed up with the glutinous saliva from the bee's mouth, and then plastered in a narrow ring around the interior of the tube. When this is sufficiently dry, another ring of the same material is added to the edge of the former, until the aperture, thus narrowed at every addition, is at length obliterated. An egg, laid at the bottom of the chamber before it was sealed up, in process of time produces a grub, which finds in its dark and narrow prison a store of food just sufficient to last it until its change into the pupa state; and the young bee, when it emerges from this condition, finds itself in possession of horny jaws with which it is able to drill its way to light and liberty, *not, however*, through the frail partitions of its fellows' chambers, which would be destruction to them, but through the solid wood at the side.

The mason-bee (*A. cornigera*, &c.) constructs little cells with a mortar formed of sand and saliva; these it erects in groups on the surfaces of stone-walls, and when the number is completed, fills up the interspaces with like mortar, building them into a common, formless mass, which soon acquires great hardness. *A. manicata*, on the other hand, makes a bed whose characteristic is softness. She scrapes the down from the stems

and leaves of certain woolly plants, and makes with it a soft nest in crevices of gates, knot-holes in palings, and similar cavities.

But perhaps the most curious instinct of these diligent insects is that of the thimble-makers. In some cases, as that of *Melitta succincta*, these are membranous, and are formed of a natural secretion; but the upholsterer-bee (*M. papaveris*), and the leaf-cutters (*A. centuncularis*, &c.), resort to the vegetable kingdom for the raw material of their highly curious and clever manufacture.

Every reader who has access to a garden must have observed in summer the leaves of the rose-bushes with oval or circular pieces cut out of them, as if an invisible fairy had been practising upon them with her scissors. Let him set a watch, and it will not be long before he will detect the operator. A bee of somewhat robust figure comes trooping through the air, and, making direct for a rose-leaf, seats herself astride upon its margin. In an instant she applies her sharp jaws to the edge, and cuts out, scissor-wise, a perfectly circular piece, which, as the incision proceeds, she rolls up between her fore legs. The moment before the fragment is severed, she opens her wings and balances them, and the next instant away she soars with her prize.

But what use does the bee make of the pieces she thus cuts out? If we could follow her flight, we should trace her to a hole in some distant bank, into which she enters with her load. We cannot actually see her at work, but an examination of the result afterwards reveals with sufficient clearness the *modus operandi*. The pieces of leaves are placed by her in succession at the bottom and around the sides of the hole, their own elasticity preserving their position and curved form. A cylinder is soon made of several layers, the centre of one piece being invariably laid over the suture of two others, and thus the work, which resembles a thimble, is found to be quite tight, and capable of containing the fluid honey which is deposited in it. Another thimble is now made in the same manner, the end of which just fits the mouth of the former. Another and another follow, each containing an egg, and filled with fluid honey. Some half-dozen of these leafy thimbles fill the length of the hole, and the mouth of the last is closed by two or three circular pieces, which fit it with wonderful accuracy. We have often seen the ingenious leaf-cutter at work, and have found the nest of thimbles so accurately made as to maintain their integrity and mutual cohesion, even when removed from the earth.

The proceedings of 'the upholsterer' are somewhat similar to

these ; but she lines her nest with a silken tapestry of the richest scarlet, her materials being always selected from the glowing petals of the corn-poppy.

‘Can we consider this curious history,’ asks Mr. Kirby, ‘without adoring that Divine Wisdom which teaches these diminutive creatures to provide in so wonderful a manner for the security and sustenance of their young? Who is it that instructs them to bore a fistular passage either under ground, or in the trunk of a tree, for the reception of their nests? What rule do they take with them to the shrub from which they borrow their materials to assist them in meting out their work, by which they cut some pieces into portions of an ellipse, others into ovals, others into accurate circles, and to suit the dimensions of the several pieces of each figure so accurately to each other? Where is the architect who can carry impressed upon the tablet of his memory the entire idea of the edifice he means to erect, and without rule, square, plumb-line, or compasses, can cut out all his materials in their exact dimensions, without making a single mistake or a single false stroke? And yet this is what these little animals invariably do, and thus teach us how much more wonderful and certain instinct is than all the efforts of our boasted reason, which after many painful processes, interrupted by numerous errors and failures, and by a long train of deductions, cannot arrive at that expertness and certainty which these creatures manifest spontaneously, working at all times with unerring precision. What is this instinct but the teaching of the Almighty, the manifestation of the Eternal Wisdom, infinitely diversified, sustaining, directing, impelling all things, and making all things work together for the good of the whole? . . . “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out. Of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things. To whom be glory for ever. Amen.”’
—*Apum Angliæ*, i. 170.

A still more potent influence on the study of insects was effected by the publication of the ‘Introduction to Entomology,’ the work of the same author, conjointly with his friend Mr. Spence. Perhaps the most interesting feature in the memoir before us is a chapter of considerable length from the pen of Mr. Spence, detailing with much minuteness the first acquaintance of these scientific friends, and the origin, progress, and completion of their admirable work. The suggestion of the present form of the ‘Introduction’ appears to have come from Mr. Spence, in reply to a proposal from Mr. Kirby that they should unite in the preparation of a treatise on British entomology, the heavy ‘*Entomologia Britannica*’ of Marsham giving indications of speedy decease. In a letter from Mr. Spence to Mr. Kirby, bearing date November 23rd, 1808, he thus alludes to his friend’s proposal:—

‘But to me there appears a desideratum, whose acquisition would

greatly contribute to the success of such a work. I mean a popular introduction to entomology; and so long have I been convinced that this want is the greatest bar to the spread of the science amongst us, that in my solitary rambles I have sometimes occupied myself in sketching mentally the plan upon which I conceived it should be composed. If you give me encouragement, I think I should be induced to give some form to my project; but it would be still better if you would become a partner in the speculation—and why not? I heartily wish you would let our partnership begin here. I could give you a sketch of my scheme: you could correct, add to it, or propose another; out of both one could be made, and we could then divide the several parts between us; and, finally, jointly amalgamate them into a whole. Pray, think of this, and give me your opinion.’—p. 286.

With the same co-partner originated the epistolary form which the ‘Introduction’ received; this form being considered peculiarly attractive: and to his tact in perceiving what was the public taste in books of science, and his judgment in adopting a familiar colloquial style in discussing and narrating facts, the subsequent popularity of this charming work was doubtless largely indebted. ‘Everybody,’ writes Mr. Spence, ‘reads with avidity anecdotes of the use, injuries, properties, habits, &c., of insects; and only admit your readers through such a vestibule, you will win numbers to the science, who would have been deterred at the very threshold of mere technical discussion. Indeed, I very much doubt whether fifty copies of a work of the latter description would be sold; of the former, I am sure, five hundred might.’—(p. 290.)

The arrangement of the proposed treatise, the parts which each author should take, and the discussion of the various subjects that successively arose, necessarily involved a voluminous correspondence; and between the years 1809 and 1815 (when the first volume appeared) nearly 150 Letters passed between Mr. Kirby and Mr. Spence, most of which were of great length, and filled with elaborate discussions of the anatomy and orismology of insects.

Every entomologist, and perhaps nearly every reader of the ‘Introduction,’ has felt a measure of curiosity to know the parts of the work which were contributed by each of the learned authors. This curiosity Mr. Spence has gratified by minutely particularizing each Letter, and each part of such Letters as were conjoint labours.

The four volumes of the work appeared *seriatim*, the last being published in 1826. Meanwhile the earlier volumes had been read with avidity, and the demand for edition after edition in rapid succession showed how truly the authors had anticipated the popular taste, and how competent they were to gratify it.

The topics embraced by this admirable model of a scientific treatise may be thus summed up. After an apology for the science, more needful before than after the publication of this work, the authors proceed to describe the Metamorphoses of insects, the Injuries, direct and indirect, the Benefits, direct and indirect, derived from them; their Care of their young, their Food, the Habitations of solitary and of social species; the Societies of the latter, the Means of defence possessed by insects, their Motions, the Sounds emitted by them, their Luminousness, their Hybernation, their Instincts, their States, their Anatomy and Physiology, Diseases and Senses. Then follow an explanation of the Terms used in the science, and a History of the progress of Entomology. The Geographical distribution, the Haunts, and the Seasons affected by certain species, are then treated of; copious Instructions are given for the collection and preservation of specimens, and the work closes with a List of Authors who have written on Entomology.

In the preface to the 'Introduction,' the study of insects is spoken of as a science which 'in nine companies out of ten with which a man may associate promises to signalize him as an object of pity or contempt.' Very different is the estimation in which the study is held in our own day, when it is said that there are upwards of fifteen hundred persons known as prosecutors of the science in this kingdom. To attribute this change wholly to the labours of an individual would be absurd, but no unprejudiced person would refuse to concede to Mr. Kirby a very prominent part in producing it. When, therefore, it was thought that the state of the science warranted the foundation of an Entomological Society, the sanction of Mr. Kirby was sought as the first entomologist in Britain; and though the establishment of such an association was not at that time accomplished, yet at the first meeting of the Zoological Club, the nucleus of the present Zoological Society, Mr. Kirby occupied the chair, and delivered the inaugural address.

Brief papers and essays on various subjects connected with his favourite science were published by Mr. Kirby during his long career, either in a separate form, in the pages of periodicals, or in the transactions of learned societies. Nearly forty of these might be enumerated; but we must content ourselves with mentioning one more work of loftier aim and more lasting reputation which proceeded from his pen. In the year 1830 he received an application to contribute one of the eight treatises 'On the Being and Attributes of God as illustrated by his Works,' for which the sum of £8000 had been bequeathed by the Earl of Bridgewater. The offer was accepted, and in 1835 the work appeared in two volumes, 'On the

History, Habits, and Instincts of Animals.' The piety of the author had always led him to seek the glory of God in his scientific works; and this end being the direct object of the Bridgewater Treatises, he found ample scope for a subject on which he delighted to speak and write. The work is extensively read, and is in no way unworthy either of its author's fame or of the companionship in which it stands.

The Entomological Society was at length established in 1833, and though Mr. Kirby was prevented by age and infirmity from being an active member, he accepted the office of honorary president. Such a mind as his, however, could not rest without devising some means of expressing sympathy with his fellow-students in entomological science. He determined to commit to the keeping of the Society his invaluable collection of insects, the accumulation of his long entomological life.

'The cabinet presented to the Society had been in the process of formation for more than forty-eight years; it had been enriched by contributions from Gyllenhal, Latreille, Peck, Marsham, MacLeay, Harris, Guilding, Vigors, Dale, Curtis, Stephens, and a host of other friends, most of whom are referred to in letters already given. Many insects had been bought at sales, and of dealers in such commodities, for sums which would astonish collectors of the present day. Represented, therefore, even in this way, it was valuable. But this is not the basis upon which we must attempt to estimate the price that was placed upon Mr. Kirby's collection when it reached its destination; it was chiefly from the connexion which it had with its donor—a memento than which it would have been difficult to have found one more striking or more appropriate, surpassing any sum that could have been offered, any portrait that could have been delineated, any book that could have been written. It is in the nature of an unprinted library upon the science, bearing the mark and stamp, as it does, of Mr. Kirby's own hand and of his own arrangement.

'There are the self-same insects which he had described and referred to in his numerous publications; there are the self-same structures exposed to view upon which he had done so much towards bringing the science to its present state of perfection.'—p. 469.

This generous donation, so much like a solemn farewell to science, proved to be the last public act of Mr. Kirby's entomological life. He had already passed the bourne of three-score years and ten; and though he lived several years after this, his connexion with entomology appears to have been thenceforward confined to his private correspondence with scientific friends. We shall here, therefore, dismiss the eminent naturalist, and take a brief glance at the man, the Christian, and the clergyman.

The character of Mr. Kirby, independent of its scientific

aspect, presented, it must be confessed, little that the biographer can seize to interest his readers. Eminent, indeed, it was for moral excellence, but this was of the quiet, gentle, unassuming sort, which, while it commends the possessor to the love and esteem of all who knew him, makes no noise in the world, and attracts no notice. Like so very many of the wise and good, he appears to have owed the bias of his amiable character, as well as his scientific predilections, to the influence of his 'very dear good mother.' In after life he always affirmed with confidence, that to his mother, and to her alone, he was indebted for a taste for natural history, as well as for his first knowledge of *the principles upon which he afterwards pursued it*. She gave him shells from her family cabinet to play with, in early infancy; and in childhood guided his rambles, and directed him to insects and flowers, and to the wisdom and skill displayed in their formation and adornment.

At college he plodded with patient industry; but his cast of mind was perhaps not fitted to achieve those brilliant distinctions which give a young man university eminence.

'His admirers will perhaps be surprised to find that he is not known to have done anything by which his name could acquire reputation or distinction in the little world in which he moved; not that there is any reason for supposing that he adopted the view of the poet Gray, who liked neither the mode of life, nor the fashion of study, and lived sullenly on to the time when his attendance on lectures was no longer required; but the fault rested perhaps rather with others than himself. By those of his own standing, who disregarded the old and well-established maxim,—*nimum ne crede colori*, he was looked upon as a man of slow mind and rather inferior ability. How far the superior and more mature judgment of the college authorities led them to a different conclusion I cannot say; of the opinion just stated, as formed by men of his own standing, I have had the most undoubted evidence. There were, however, some who appreciated his perhaps hidden stores of knowledge, and even then sought his friendship. That his time was not wasted in pleasure is very manifest from the large collection of papers which remain, written by him at college; the greater number of them being compilations or arrangements of other authors, which, if they did not show originality, did at least bespeak perseverance and judgment. These papers were principally on moral, philosophical, and classical subjects, for the two last of which he had evidently a taste; and had either of them alone offered a road to distinction, it is probable that he might have appeared before the world in a different light as regards his studies at Cambridge.'—p. 21.

There are perhaps few deep-thinking Christians who have not at some time in their course been near enough to the whirlpool of Socinianism to feel the fascination of its spells. Mr. Kirby, while at Cambridge, was in danger from this heresy; a cir-

cumstance that does not strike us with that amazement which his biographer seems to anticipate from the announcement; for, as we have intimated, it is a very common temptation to young men, when beginning to think seriously and *freely* upon the deep things of God. It is a matter of thankfulness to find that in the instance before us the poison was counteracted by the power of Divine grace; for in the long course of his after life his faith in the verities of Christianity appears to have been firm and constant.

At the age of twenty-three, Mr. Kirby was ordained Deacon by the Bishop of Norwich, and received an appointment to the cure of that parish, which he never resigned till called by his gracious Master to receive the reward of his labours. Whether at this time he had experienced that 'new creation in Christ Jesus,' which the Word of God teaches to be absolutely indispensable, and if so, at what period of his youth the momentous change took place, his biographer has not made very clear. What is much more important is the evidence derived from his own testimony and his own life. The following extract from his correspondence with his friend Mr. Rodwell, proves that the views which he held, and which he preached, were clear and full on the matter of personal conversion:—

'I proceed to the third measure of grace, for the sanctification of individuals. With respect to this, amongst those that allow it, there seem to be two opinions: some hold that it is merely an influence of the Holy Spirit upon the will, inclining it to the love and practice of virtue, and that those expressions respecting a new birth, *et similia*, are metaphorical; which appears to be an opinion of too many divines of the present day. The other opinion is, that literally a new birth and a new creation take place in the heart of the Christian, a principle of spiritual life from the Holy Ghost, whereby we become partakers of the Divine nature, and temples of God; that this is not only an influence upon, and an aid to our old natural powers, but absolutely a new principle, which by the Holy Ghost, is sown in our hearts, where, if duly encouraged, it springeth up and taketh root downwards, and beareth fruit upwards, receiving its proper nutriment from God; and this is the doctrine of the Scriptures and our church.'

Sixty-eight years was this worthy man a resident in the quiet parsonage of Barham; passing from youth to grey hairs in the assiduous but noiseless duties of a country clergyman, and in the delightful recreations of that study which made life to him one long holiday. The scene of his labours was one of more than ordinary charm for the lover of external nature.

The inoculation of this country with the atheistic and democratic leaven of France, towards the close of the last century, had filled many godly persons with consternation; and many

well-directed and faithful efforts were made to counteract its fatal working. In the ranks of those who sought to stem the poisonous flood we find the name of Kirby associated with one yet more venerable,—that of Jones of Nayland. Their desire was to establish a ‘Society for the Reformation of Principles,’ and to employ literary means in the preservation of religion, government, and law, against the attacks of infidels and seditious demagogues. The investigation of the questions that were then pressing upon men’s minds with alarming force seems to have turned Mr. Kirby’s attention to the study of prophecy, in its bearing on the age in which we live. He was led to adopt the expectation of the near advent of the Lord Jesus, to be preceded by a short time of great woe, and affliction, and tribulation; while, rejecting the opinion generally received by the Protestant churches, that the predictions concerning the Man of Sin have their accomplishment in the papacy, he looked for the rise of an individual Antichrist, who would make an *open profession* of atheism, and would finally fall in the Holy Land. We shall not discuss the truth or error of these views, but content ourselves with alluding to the influence they exercised on Mr. Kirby’s life and labours. He contemplated at one time an elaborate work on the subject, for which he studied hard, and accumulated considerable materials: it was at length, however, laid aside; and though it was after some time resumed, it was never carried to completion.

Considering the methodical character of Mr. Kirby’s mind, his great industry, his zeal for the glory of God, and his abilities as a writer, it is somewhat remarkable that he never published anything on pure theology, beyond a single volume of sermons. These, also, were scarcely original, as both their title and their handling were furnished to his hand. They were, in fact, Bishop Andrews’s Seven Sermons on our Lord’s Temptation, and one on the Passion, modernized, and somewhat remodelled. This publication, or rather reprint, took place in 1829.

No ecclesiastical preferment ever fell to his lot: fourteen years he remained curate of Barham; in 1796, the living was presented to him on the death of the late rector, from which time to the year 1838 he performed the whole of the duties without the assistance of a curate. At the period last named he appointed Mr. Freeman to the curacy, and to that selection doubtless we owe many of the interesting details with which this gentleman has enriched the biography of his venerable friend.

Up to four-score years it might almost have been said of the amiable rector of Barham, that, like Moses, ‘his eye was

not dim, nor his natural force abated.' His was a green old age; all his faculties were in action, and his power of enjoyment, and mental energy seemed scarcely diminished. The sudden decease of his beloved partner (his second wife) in 1844, proved, however, so great a shock as to shatter, and ultimately to dissolve his earthly tabernacle. Yet he lingered on in weakness and resignation to 1850, and on the 4th of July in that year, calmly and peacefully fell asleep.

If to present a vivid portrait of the subject treated of, to leave on the mind of the reader an agreeable and lasting remembrance of his character, and to draw forcibly the moral lessons of instruction deducible from his example,—if these be excellencies in a biography,—then has Mr. Freeman well performed his task. The hero is constantly before the eye, the biographer rarely or never.

ART. III.—*Isis: An Egyptian Pilgrimage.* By James Augustus St. John. In Two Volumes. 12mo. London: Longman and Co.

THIS is a singular work, wholly unexampled in our experience, and deeply interesting. To us, at least, it has proved so, and the further we have proceeded in its perusal, the more complete has been the fascination in which it held us. The vagueness of its title, and the absence of any explicit and matter-of-fact statement of the time and circumstances of the author's departure from England, may tempt some sober-minded readers to throw the work aside as unsuited to their taste, and not adapted to enlarge their knowledge. The words with which it opens, 'I dreamt a dream, in early youth,' may serve to confirm their purpose, and the first pages of the work will probably conduce to the same end. The practical mind of England, of which we so much boast, will anticipate little good from an author in whose productions the *ideal* is so prominent,—who evidently views the *outward* only as suggestive, and though richly furnished with the fruits of extensive travel, takes more pleasure in the world of intellect than in that of sense. And yet we warn such readers not to be hasty. Let them proceed a little way in the company of Mr. St. John, let them—if needs be—do violence to themselves in the attentive perusal of the earlier portion of his volumes, and they must be phlegmatic and unsympathetic indeed if they do not learn to prize his society, and to regret when they arrive at the conclusion of his

travels. From some of his opinions we dissent ; occasionally we deem his lucubrations cloudy, and his lore misapplied ; his path sometimes verges towards forbidden ground, and his speculations anon awaken our fears. His special temperament colors all the objects he beholds, and presents them consequently in a light vastly different from that to which we are accustomed. The light and the grave, the spiritual and the earthly, the refinements of an advanced civilization, and the tastes of pastoral life, the intellect which quickens inanimate forms and a child-like simplicity which finds pleasure in the normal condition of man wherever found, and by whatever circumstances surrounded, are all blended with a truthfulness which wins regard and ensures confidence. Some of the author's speculations are vague and shadowy, springing out of the domain of imagination rather than the realms of fact. Occasionally, but not often, he verges toward the wearisome ; but 'there is method in his madness ;' and by some vivid picture, some bright description, some absorbing tale, he revives the interest of his readers, and strengthens their attachment to his company. There is, moreover, a frankness in his admissions which we love. The snatches of autobiography with which the work abounds contribute greatly to its charm, and let us into its secret. Much that would otherwise be unintelligible is thus explained. Knowing the tastes, and sympathies, and predilections of the author, we are able to appreciate his views and emotions, and where we cannot approve we yet understand. As an instance, we may refer to his acknowledgment of 'a fondness for the remote in place or time, for the indistinct, the shadowy, the wildly fanciful, and, perhaps also, at times, for the supernatural and incredible. In my own case,' he adds, 'Hebrew, and Hellenic, and Roman antiquity, and the history and traditions of El-Islam, and the narratives of travellers, and the descriptions of poets, combined to invest the land of the Nile with an irresistible charm for my imagination.' This passage furnishes a key to much which follows, and it must be borne in mind if the author's labors are to be duly appreciated. To a cold and unsusceptible reader, some passages of the work will appear visionary and mystical ; but those of a warmer temperament will rise with the elevations of the author, and experience a sympathy, and it may be, a clearness of vision, before which the bright forms of truth stand exposed.

On our author's arrival at Alexandria, he was stunned, as all travellers must expect to be, by a Babel of various tongues.

'The Levant seemed to have deputed a specimen of all its various populations to greet us, Jews and Arabs, Turks and Armenians, Syrians, Parthians, and Elamites, and the dwellers about Mesopotamia.

When sitting quietly by my own fireside, I used to fancy myself something of a linguist, but the sounds which now whizzed and bubbled around me were like nothing I had ever heard before;—scraps of Romaic intermingled with fragments of the *Lingua Franca*,—half sentences in Turkish, interrupted by the louder and more impetuous Arabic, — Hebrew mutterings drowned in the deep gutturals of German, and snatches of the *Lingua Tuscana*, no longer musical, absorbed and lost in the indiscrible utterance of the Slavonic dialects.'—Vol. i. p. 15.

'It is an unfortunate thing in Africa,' he tells us, 'to possess an intolerant nose.' The refined and polished classes, particularly the women, are fastidiously clean and delicate, but the Franks in the Levant, and the lower order of traders, are the very reverse. Mr. St. John frequently adverts to this nuisance, and it seems to have been the only point on which he was assailable. In all other matters he was eminently qualified for his undertaking, but the terms in which he refers to the offensive odours of Egyptian towns show how acutely his sense of smelling was offended.

We are glad to read our author's testimony to the hospitality of our countrymen in Alexandria. 'The English,' he says, 'whatever they may be elsewhere, are a hospitable people. I had brought letters with me for persons who had just then happened to be absent; but this did not signify. I was invited out right and left, and could I have dined seven times a-day, I should scarcely have been able to satisfy those magnificent Franks, who used the Spanish phrase, and meant it, when they assured me that their house was my own—that is, for as long as I chose to stay.' The estimate formed of the Arabs by Mr. St. John is much higher than that generally expressed by those who have visited them. 'I like the Arabs,' he says, and then honestly warns his reader to bear this in mind in estimating his opinion. 'It is not,' he adds, 'the testimony of an impartial person; it is the testimony of a man, who constantly, during a long period, received favours, kindnesses, and benefits at their hands, and who, therefore, cannot be expected to speak of them with complete indifference. My remarks, however, apply exclusively to the Muslim part of the population, with whom alone I associated.'

It is well that he entertained this confidence, as on some occasions it saved him much pain. When leaving Alexandria, for instance, he was suffering from fever, which increased upon him so seriously, that some of his companions spoke of leaving him in the charge of their Arab attendants. This, it must be confessed, would have tried the nerves of most Englishmen; but our author tells us: 'As I had great faith in these marauding

gentlemen, my uneasiness at this intimation was not great. To me the children of Ishmael have always been most kind and attentive, and I verily believe, that had I been left to their care, the men of the village would have attended me like friends, while the women would have nursed me like sisters.' Happily a draught of coffee, seasoned with cloves, threw him into a profuse perspiration, which enabled him speedily to resume his journey. His opinion of the Arab women is equally favorable. 'I never saw,' he assures us, 'an immodest woman in the desert; their manners are free, easy, graceful, and would be thought to indicate a high degree of civilization, if it were not evident that they are inspired by unsophisticated nature.'

We are not surprised at the influence of the desert on a mind constituted like Mr. St. John's. The butterflies of European cities are incapable of appreciating it. They will probably smile contemptuously at his emotions, and wonder what there could be in mere vastness and silence to inspire them. They see only an interminable waste, arid sands, and burning heavens. Living in an artificial world, they cannot comprehend the thoughts, have no sympathy with the feelings which crowd less sophisticated minds as they stand on the limits of civilization, and gaze onward into that vast region where the sons of Ishmael flit to and fro. Such minds see more than is visible to the mere spawn of European civilization. The desert is thronged with life; imagination supplies the place of sight; memory unfolds her stores; and the traditions of ancient times give a complexion and vividness to the scene which reality cannot equal. Mr. St. John belongs to this class, and the following brief passage expresses the feelings inspired by such a scene:—

'There is a magic for me in the Desert, inexplicable by any philosophy I possess. Whenever I touch upon it, my frame appears to dilate, I breathe the air with tenfold pleasure, and seem to be already tasting the joys of immortality. God forbid that I should cherish feelings hostile to my species, or that I should desire to be placed beyond the reach of their kindness and sympathy. Still, it is most true that the serenest, happiest, and most delicious moments of my life, were those in which I stood alone or with a small band of wandering Arabs upon the skirts of the mighty Desert, which, as its image entered my soul, appeared to expand it to almost infinite dimensions.' —Ib. p. 121.

Arrived at Cairo, our author repaired to the village of Shahrâh, 'the Eleusis of Modern Egypt,' where the mysteries of the Ghawazi are celebrated. Many accounts have been given of

the singing and dancing girls of Egypt. 'In whatever light we view them, it is impossible to comprehend the nature of Egyptian society without ascertaining their real position. At once degraded and courted, condemned to a life resembling that of outcasts, yet admitted occasionally into the most respectable company, flouted and despised even by the very libertines who frequent their dwellings, yet introduced into the harims of the great, and employed to instruct their female children in singing and dancing; we may be truly said to possess in Europe no class resembling them.' The characteristics of this class are strikingly illustrative of the state of morals in Egypt, yet we must beware of drawing from them the same conclusions as would be warranted in Europe. The standard of morality which they indicate is sadly low and defective, but we must not confound them with the yet deeper debasement which a prurient curiosity may discover in the very centres of civilization. It has often been a matter of surprise to us that respectable members of English society—husbands and parents—could permit those entrusted to them to witness the scenes or listen to the language, which frequently defile our theatres. We know that such things are not always seen and heard, but their recurrence is sufficiently frequent to explain much of the moral laxity that prevails. At any rate, the things we do tolerate, should render us lenient in our judgments on others. If, with our superior intelligence and morality, we yet permit what our places of public resort exhibit, it is little better than hypocrisy to express disgust at such spectacles as our author witnessed. We should be cautious in drawing severe conclusions from facts which, though more obviously gross, are not more essentially alien from mental purity, than some things which we permit.

Mr. St. John was present at a singular scene in the *Tombs of the Kings* at Thebes. These celebrated remains consisted of a suite of apartments, some of them very lofty, and when lighted up, 'they assume a splendid and mysterious appearance, their dimensions being so great as to leave some portion of them always enveloped in shadow.' In this strange apartment, as if in mockery of death, a grand dinner was served up. 'The dishes were numerous, the covers of silver, the decanters of cut crystal, and all the other appurtenances such as the old subjects of Rameses might have envied.' The coffins of the dead were around the revellers, and we are not surprised to learn that our author's 'sensations became now and then extremely unpleasant.' After dinner a scene was enacted which throws a saddening light on the state of Egyptian

society. There was no consciousness of impropriety, no sense of indecorum in it. It was in accordance with national custom, and would seem to have been no otherwise regarded than as a source of ordinary recreation.

Before the purifying influences of Christianity such pastimes as 'the dance of the Bee' will disappear. They may suit the sensuous religion of the false prophet, but are in obvious and striking contrast with the faith of the Son of God. That such scenes should be the *amusement* of a people says more than volumes could utter in proof their moral degradation. Well may inspiration tell us 'the whole head is sick, the whole heart is faint.' Society wants renewing in the primary elements of its moral nature, when exhibitions of this order are not only tolerated, but are deemed the fitting modes of social entertainment.

Mr. St. John and his companion declared war against the whole tribe of crocodiles in Egypt, and made many unsuccessful efforts to obtain a portion of one of them for breakfast. On some occasions he came into rather closer contact with them than was agreeable. This was the case soon after leaving Thebes, when he passed through the district where they attain the largest size. Walking on the sand before sun-rise, he noticed one of these animals just rising above the water, and our author, thinking discretion the better part of valour, retreated somewhat hastily towards the boat. The following notice of the habits of this animal will be read with pleasure:—

'Sir James Brooke informs me that the alligators of Borneo are far less scrupulous. They will kill men and swallow them whole; and he says that his people, on ripping one open, found in his stomach a poor Dyak, very little the worse for keeping, who, with his vest and canvas trowsers on, had lain in that strange cemetery for upwards of a fortnight.

'The crocodiles of Egypt are more delicate in their tastes, for though they will devour children, or even women, they seem to entertain an objection to eating men, whom they probably find difficult of digestion.

'Just before our arrival, an Arab girl, who had descended to the Nile for water, was just stooping to fill her pitcher, when a crocodile struck her with his tail, and, tumbling her into the river, walked off with her into his den, where he devoured her at his leisure.

'Out of revenge for such practices we endeavoured to get some crocodile steaks for breakfast; but, after firing at them incessantly, found it to be of no avail, and ultimately we departed from the land of the Pharaohs without having once tasted that delicacy. But *en revanche*, as our neighbours say, we shot and ate a siksak, the trochilos Herodotus, a sort of gentleman-in-waiting on the crocodile, about which history and tradition tell strange stories.

‘What they say is this,—that the crocodile being too much addicted to live in water with his jaws open, allows a number of leeches to creep down his throat, where, vigorously sucking his blood, they prove extremely troublesome. Against these enemies, however, he finds a faithful ally in the siksak, which as soon as he perceives, he opens his delicate mouth, and the bird, rendered bold by instinct, leaps, like another Curtius, into the gulf, not to be swallowed up however, but to swallow.

‘He kills and devours the leeches, and then, hopping out, receives the thanks of the crocodile. Sometimes, this lumbering animal, getting sleepy during the process, mechanically closes his jaws so as to deprive his little friend of air; upon which, extending his wings, furnished with sharp spikes on the tops of the shoulders, he wounds the crocodile’s throat, and reminds him that it is his business to be civil.

‘For the truth of the story I will not answer, but certain it is that these birds have the sharp spike on the wings, and that I seldom, perhaps never, saw a crocodile without a siksak standing close beside him on the sand, evidently within his reach, but without his exhibiting the slightest desire to molest or injure it. The bird is about the size of a dove, beautiful of plumage, and very good eating.’—Vol ii. pp. 196—198.

Our traveller’s course was not always free from other dangers. The disturbed state of the districts through which he passed was frequently pointed out to him, and entreaties were not wanting to induce an abandonment of his purpose. Still he persevered, and even when appearances were most alarming, maintained his equanimity and hopefulness. A less courageous man, or one less intent on his object, would have paused in his career; but Mr. St. John was not to be deterred. He had proposed to himself a certain route, and at all hazards pursued it. On arriving with his friend, Mr. Vere, at Tameia, the crisis of his fate seemed to be attained.

‘We found the town,’ he says, ‘in possession of the rebel Mograbins, and two of their horsemen, spear in hand, mounting guard at the door of the caravanserai. Between these gentlemen we passed on, our Mahazi chief muttering to me as we did so, that it was all over with us. He scorned to lament his own fate, but he burst forth into unsophisticated lamentations at the loss of his camels. Vere, who had always something comfortable to say on such occasions, gave a knowing look, as we alighted from our dromedaries, and said drolly, in his provincial dialect,—

“‘I say, old fellow, we have putt our futt in it! These thievish friends of yours,”—he always complimented me by applying this name to the Bedouins,—“will certainly walk into our goods and chattels, and if we don’t get our throats cut this blessed night, we shall return to the valley to-morrow as naked as robins.”

‘Laughing heartily at this sally, I gave Mahommed and Abou-Zaid

directions about the supper, after which we went forth, the Mograbins not preventing us, to see the town, with its vast sluices and water-works, and to catch, if possible, a glimpse of Lake Moeris. The inhabitants, freed from the restraints of authority, were impudent, but by no means insolent or brutal. They followed us in crowds, and laughed at us a great deal, which was perfectly natural, as we no doubt cut a comical figure in their eyes; Vere, with his red beard and straw hat, and I with my anomalous costume, half Frank, half Turkish; for I sometimes wore one sort of dress, sometimes another. Had these people been the ferocious marauders they are generally supposed to be, why did they not knock us on the head at once? There was nothing to hinder them. The Pasha's authority was for the time completely at an end, and at no future period, whatever might turn up, would it have been practicable for the Egyptian government to pursue and punish our murderers. If they spared us, therefore, it was because they acted under the influence of those principles of justice which in all countries sway the conduct of the majority.—Vol. i. pp. 258, 259.

On returning to the caravanserai, our travellers were somewhat alarmed by finding that the guard at their door was increased. Still they wisely suppressed their fears, and in the morning, says Mr. St. John, 'our throats, and even our baggage and camels were in exactly the same state as when we lay down to rest.' The confidence shown had won on the Arabs, who sent the travellers forward with a messenger to prevent their being injured by any of the tribe with whom they might meet. The precaution was a prudent one, as the subsequent narrative proves. Had they not been so accompanied, they could scarcely have escaped the dangers which surrounded them.

The following passage gives an insight into the domestic life of the east, somewhat different from what we are accustomed to. We cannot fully assent to our author's theory, and are quite sure that all our fair countrywomen will enter their protest against it. Whatever may be alleged in extenuation of the evils incident to the usage referred to, its general tendency is to deteriorate the female character, and to deprive social life of its special charm and virtue. Mr. St. John says,—

'We probably form a false conception of the life of the harim, misled by writers who suppose its inhabitants to be swayed by a system of ideas different from that which really prevails among them. My own opinion is, that they are quite as happy as the rest of their sex, otherwise nature would not have given perpetuity to the institution, which seems quite as suitable to the East as very different institutions to the North. At any rate, the women themselves are the best judges, and they appear on the whole no less contented than their sisters of Frankistan.

'Besides, their seclusion is not so absolute as we imagine. I have

seen respectable men and their wives going out to spend the evening pleasantly in the fields between Cairo and Shoubra, forming little groups, but not so far removed as to prevent conversation. They did not, of course, belong to the upper classes, which everywhere sacrifice the heart and its best affections to pride and vanity; but were probably shopkeepers, or what is called in the East, little merchants, extremely comfortable, and, as we express it, well to do. At any rate, if mirth be a criterion, they are as happy as Greeks, for they talked, laughed, related stories and anecdotes, smoked, drank sherbet, and ate sweetmeats and all sorts of delicacies with much greater gusto than the same number of princes and princesses in the sombre North.

'Again, when I visited the Mosque of Flowers, I saw at least four or five hundred women, many of them of the highest rank, distributed through the various aisles, in pleasant little groups seated on carpets, some sewing, others suckling their children, others talking and laughing, or eating and drinking, while their slaves stood round in attendance. As I was dressed like a Turk, they bestowed no more attention on me than on any other person. So I gazed on them at my leisure, while I affected to be regarding the architecture, the colours of the painted windows, and the materials of the pavement.

'Even in the bazaars, when not too strictly attended, the Muslim women sometimes venture to converse with strangers, sending forth their soft voices, at first, perhaps, from behind their veils, but as the dialogue warms, throwing aside these for a moment and exhibiting their beauty, as the moon flashes from behind a cloud.'—*Ib.* pp. 292, 293.

We must restrict ourselves to one more extract, from which it will be seen that our author's path was crossed by a large party of female slaves brought by Turkish soldiers from the interior. We have heard much of the marauding expeditions of these troops, which are the fit instruments of the despotism they serve. Still it is obvious to remark, that Europeans may blush on comparing their 'slave-trade' with that of Egypt. The intelligent and so-called Christian nations of Europe have far exceeded the atrocities perpetrated by the followers of the Mosque. The majority of the slaves met with by Mr. St. John were Negresses, and the remainder were Galla or Abyssinian women. They were, apparently, indifferent to their fate,—reduced so low in the scale of intelligence as to be susceptible of pleasurable emotions notwithstanding their social degradation.

'They were kept in a large fold like sheep, with an enclosure of calico stretched on poles, to protect them from the gaze of strangers; but they contrived, poor girls, to exhibit their beauty, in spite of their jealous owners; for, getting on tip-toe and resting their chins on the calico, they showed us, as we passed, their laughing faces.

'Some of them on the following night managed to get out, and the excitement they created in Korosko is not to be described. The

honest Turks, their masters, fatigued by their long march across the desert, had fallen fast asleep, and so also had the native guardians set over the female slaves.

‘The opportunity was not to be overlooked, so they resolved to enjoy a few hours of freedom, which they spent as they pleased in the village, drinking, singing, and dancing with the Nubians, till they judged it time to return to their prison, where in the morning they were all found looking as innocent as if nothing had happened.

‘I saw one or two of the Galla girls by candle-light. They were of a dark bronze cast, and extremely pretty; but the Abyssinians were too fat and lazy to come out, or perhaps the aperture through which the others forced themselves could not accommodate their more liberal proportions. * *

‘Of slavery nothing too bad can be said. It is the worst of all crimes man commits against nature; but to do the Orientals justice, they manage to deprive this villanous institution of many of its worst features. Still, to be the goods and chattels of another is to be in a pitiable condition, because, though it may be the interest of your owner to treat you kindly, people are not always alive to their own best interests, and often yield to the suggestions of passion and rage, instead of curbing them for the advantage of their pockets. Fearful stories are told in Egypt of the cruelty practised on slaves, and though these are the exceptions, they suffice to show what every person in servitude may be exposed to by chance.’—Vol. ii. pp. 250, 251.

We part from Mr. St. John with regret. His volumes have afforded us much pleasure, and convey a more vivid and life-like picture of the monuments and people of Egypt than many more ambitious works. They afford a highly successful specimen of the manner in which a traveller's narrative may be made to interest, as well as to inform, various classes of readers. Combining some of the best qualities of fiction and of history, they amuse while they instruct;—at once stimulate the imagination, store the memory, and refine the sentiments. The narrative of travellers is frequently a dry detail of what was seen and encountered; but ‘Isis’ is a work of stirring interest, which mingles the light and the grave, sentiments and facts, mythological disquisitions, personal anecdotes, and the portraiture of social life, in such happy proportions, as must render it a pleasing companion to a very large class.

ART. IV.—*Bases of Belief. An Examination of Christianity as a Divine Revelation by the Light of Recognised Facts and Principles.*
In Four Parts. By Edward Miall, M.P. London: Hall, Virtue, and Co. 1853.

THERE are two perfectly distinct yet harmonious objects at which writers may aim in exhibiting the claims of Christianity to be received as a divine revelation. One of these aims is to establish believers in their faith, by showing them the strong reasons of various kinds which are capable of being adduced on its behalf; the other is to correct the misrepresentations and repel the objections of unbelievers, in such a way as to render them powerless in the judgment of the candid reasoner; thus preparing the way for a fair examination, first, of Christianity itself, and then of those peculiarities in its character and history, which satisfy intelligent disciples that it is a revelation from God. From the apologies of the early fathers, Justin, Tertullian, and Origen, to the large collections of Lardner, so skilfully arranged and abridged by Paley, we can trace a succession of Christian advocates, including the cherished names of Arnobius, Eusebius, Theodoret, Lactantius, and Augustine, the scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages, and the shining lights of the seventeenth century. While the objects aimed at by all these numerous writers were the same, it is instructive to observe how their methods of reasoning have been diversified by the nature of the superstitions or philosophies which in their times were respectively opposed to the Christian revelation, and also by the general style of thinking cultivated in common by Christians and by their opponents. In modern times, as might be naturally expected, we meet with similar diversity in the courses pursued by the defenders of our faith. The deism of England, passing through the literature of France into the philosophy of Germany, was ably combated at home by Boyle, Baxter, Sherlock, and other well-known names; in France by Pascal and Abadie; in Germany by Pfaff, Stiebritz, Haller, and the most eminent composers of dogmatic systems. The more recent attacks on the authority of the Christian revelation, we need scarcely say, have emanated from the successive developments of speculative philosophy in the application of the higher criticism to the documents of history, and to the structure of philology. Assuming that an historical religion must become absorbed by reason into its own ideal, and that every form of knowledge is equally a divine revelation, this philosophy (more or less) pervades the theological literature of modern Germany:

it has been adopted in England, by some to modify the technical forms of theological teaching, and by others to supersede the necessity, and to invalidate the claims, of the Christian revelation.

This process has not escaped the observation of large-minded Christians versed in the speculations and the literature on which the impugnors of Christianity rely. Its history has been unfolded by Lerminier, Villemain, and Amand Saintes in France; in Germany by Henke and Schlosser; long controversies have been carried on in various periodical publications; and valuable materials for thought are contained in Beard's 'Voice of the Churches,' and Dr. Vaughan on 'The Age and Christianity.' It would seem pre-eminently to require the practical understanding of Englishmen to draw forth the claims of Christianity from the regions into which these attempts at obscurity are made, and to show that nothing has been really done in these times, any more than in those which have passed away, to justify the scepticism that talks so largely of religion without authority and faith without evidence, of a revelation without a book, Christianity without the Gospels, and worship without a priest. We doubt not that the special views of philosophers and scholars, put forth in sundry miscellaneous forms, will find their way to the common mind of England in good time to act in wholesome correction of whatever influence may reach it from such remote quarters. Meanwhile, the greater part of thoughtful Christians have been apparently unmoved by the kind of objections to the New Testament of which they hear or read. Without being able to give logical shape to their convictions, they have felt that they were too well founded to be disturbed by anything short of a power that could shake the foundations of their mental life. Knowing that the Bible has stood alone amid the books of the world—that it has been most prized by the intelligent, the virtuous, and the free—that the belief of its teachings has been the quickener of whatever goodness and joy have relieved the sad monotony of human crime and woe—and that it has come forth unscathed from the tests of eighteen centuries—they find it difficult to imagine why any heed should be given to the modern assailants of its divinity. Nor is this unreasoning prejudice. There lies beneath it a principle capable of logical expression, and of irrefragable demonstration. The principle is—that the Christianity of the New Testament is a power belonging to the practical life of man, which can no more be hindered than the circulation of the blood can, by speculations concerning it. To expound this principle—exhibiting its harmony with all other truths of the same order, its bearings on the entire economy of human existence, and its special power of giving fixity of belief

in the midst of speculative changes, would be to render good service to mankind at large. Such an exposition would not, indeed, supersede the evidences which warrant our confidence in the literary integrity, historical authority, and supernatural origin of our sacred writings; though it would afford the highest amount of satisfaction to devout and practical minds not in a condition for appreciating more elaborate treatises; while it would rescue such treatises from the real or feigned contempt with which it has become the fashion in some quarters to allude to them.

Some such service has been contemplated by the writer of the work now before us. It is due alike to him and to the truth of which he is the advocate, that we should take his own statement of the special design with which he has composed his treatise. He neither purposes to prove that Christianity is of God, nor fully to exhibit his belief of what Christianity is. He does, indeed, deal more or less both with the evidences and with the doctrines of Christianity, but that is only for the purpose of illustrating the importance of his definite object.

'This is not, in any sense a book *of* evidences in support of Christianity, but a book *on* evidences in relation to the question. The object has been to make out that the proof tendered on behalf of the gospel is of a *kind* which true philosophy is bound to accept. Of late, there has been a manifest disposition to pooh-pooh the labours of former champions of the faith, as if they were utterly beside the mark, now that the human mind has made such wonderful advances in its mode of examining this and similar subjects. Certainly, the tone assumed by modern sceptics has not been that of self-diffidence—and, perhaps, it will be seen that they who are most forward to take liberties with the name of philosophy, have been least careful to exemplify its spirit. But, be this as it may, the Author has appealed from speculative dogmatism to undeniable facts and universally recognised principles, with a view to establish some Rules of Court in accordance with which credible testimony should be heard. If he is right, the greater proportion of the evidences which have been arbitrarily rejected, of late, as impertinent, are restored to their former credit—and the conclusion at which we arrive is this, that former lines of argument had become obsolete, merely because unsound *criteria* of judgment had been adopted.'—Preface, pp. iv., v.

The arrangement of the volume is remarkably clear. It is divided into four parts:—The PHENOMENON, the REVELATION, the SEAL, the RECORD, corresponding with the facts intended to be regarded as the 'Bases of Belief' in 'Christianity as a Divine Revelation.' These four 'Bases' are:—Christianity presents a phenomenon of which its own records give a suitable explanation;—There is a congruity between our subjective want of such a manifestation of God, as shall quicken us into

spiritual life, and the objective manifestation of God embodied in the person of Jesus Christ;—Miracles are suitable attestations from God that Jesus Christ is *the* manifestation which God has given of Himself to meet our spiritual want;—And an historical record, the best conceivable vehicle for the permanent and universal publication of a revelation so attested, and capable of decisive proof, has been given. Treating Christianity thus, as involving a series of unquestionable facts reaching from the beginning of our era to the present day, constituting the progress of a living spiritual power of the most elevating character, and having no parallel in the history of nations, the author gives a luminous outline of its progress, and asks:—

‘To what are we to refer it? How may we most satisfactorily explain it? Wherein consists its singular potency over the religious element of man’s constitution? Does it come from God, or from man? by way of revelation, or by intuition? Is its strength that of truth, or of error? If of truth, is it associated in its origin with an external history upon which we can substantially rely, or with an accumulation of fabulous traditions, myths, and fictions? We submit that any inquiry into the origin of Christianity which does not recognise it as a stimulant of spiritual life, and which regards it merely in its relation to our intellectual faculties, must be, from the nature of the case, eminently unsatisfactory. We have to make out, if possible, the natural history, not of a certain system of opinions, but of an active spiritual force. Our main business is with the dynamics of the question.’—pp. 56, 57.

The writer proceeds, in the second part, to gather from the New Testament the kind of object which Christianity was intended to accomplish, by using suasion rather than instruction; which object he shows to be the awakening of spiritual life, rather than the communication of new religious ideas. This design, being in plain accordance with that aptitude for religion which claims dominion over human nature, yet not provided for either within the limits of man’s own being, or in the material universe, is not repugnant to reason, though distinguished by characteristics of its own. Avoiding theological technicalities, and abstaining from a complete representation of those purposes of the Christian revelation which are so familiar to believers, the author seizes the central object, and presents that as THE REVELATION of God,—a revelation made, not to the intellect, but to the moral sensibilities of our nature, and, for this reason, not in any form analogous to systematic teaching, but in the form of an actual human *life*. His illustrations of this argument are generally given with force, and expressed with the vivacity and fluency of popular address. On the notion which has excited some attention—that man’s *intuitional consciousness* suffices for all the ends proposed by revela-

tion, and is, in fact, the only revelation possible of moral and spiritual truths, Mr. Miall's observations strike us as deserving attention for what we cannot better describe than their sensibleness.

‘We need hardly waste time on this singular speculation—but we do hope it is not intended to pass for profound philosophy. Perhaps we shall be forgiven, if we remind those who look with favour on this hypothesis that the process of evolution in this case, even if it could, in the nature of things, be successful, must require a great deal of previous abstraction, for which not one man in a million is qualified, and that when the truth, which was supposed to lie enfolded in our constitution, has been seized and brought to light, strong suspicion may be reasonably excited that it came from without to where it was found, and that it has only been recovered from forgetfulness, not originated by intuition and reflection. These felicitous instances of conjectured spontaneity in the production of religious ideas from the soil of the human mind, never seem to have occurred under conditions which would have rendered the dropping into it of a chance seed wholly impossible. On the contrary, they who deem themselves most independent, in their spiritual musings, of all external aids and ministrations, are those also who have in earlier life taken in a liberal supply of religious aliment from sources which they may have forgotten, but which, nevertheless, were, and still are, on the outside of their own being. The speculation, therefore, does not offer itself to our notice with any strong recommendation of internal probability, and that which it has to say for itself is very far from being unimpeachable. Now this, to say the least, is unfortunate in an attempt to establish a fact utterly unlike, and seemingly at right angles with, every other fact with which we are acquainted. Our physical appetites, assuredly do not find their material of satisfaction within themselves. Our senses rely for meet occupation and reward upon outward objects. Our intellect does not originate its own conceptions, apart from appropriate external embodiments of truth. We do not draw up our ideas of beauty from the obscure abyss of our own nature. Even the glorious faculty of insight presupposes objectivity as a necessary condition of its exercise. For, intuition must not be confounded with self-production. It merely sees *at a glance* latent and evasive truths which the mind would otherwise have reached by a ratiocinative process. That which it detects so instantaneously, is not fire in its own eye, but light emitted by some external object—light, however, which it perceives where other eyes would fail by a high state of sympathetic sensitiveness. Even to religious intuition, therefore, there must be a revelation through some medium, in order to knowledge and emotion.’—pp. 93—95.

Having shown that the capacity in human nature with which religion has to do, is that of feeling rather than that of knowing, —however necessary knowledge may be in order to feeling, the writer seeks in vain, among the wonders of nature and

science, for *that particular revelation of God which quickens and nourishes the religious life in the human soul*, and he proves, both by argument and experience, that what the physical creation is not *designed* to teach is that which Christianity *does* teach. On this peculiar teaching, both its substance and its mode, Mr. Miall's elucidations will afford pleasure to many and satisfaction to not a few. The life of Christ is the centre of the Gospel. That life is here represented as *the Revelation of God to our moral sympathies*. He who is the Son of God, one with the Father, in whom 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,' is 'GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH.' This is what the author finds in the New Testament as its revelation. From this point, therefore, and from none other, he argues, can the question of its right to be received according to its own representation be decided. This is the cardinal point on which his entire argument turns. If men will lay down speculative principles as to what a revelation *must* be, and how it ought to be proved, they are not treating this particular question, he contends, on its own merits. They are substituting something else for the thing before them. He calmly rebuts any objection founded on the imagined opposition of such a revelation as he describes, to reason, by exhibiting its perfect harmony with the actual constitution of human nature, and with all the analogous methods in which God is acknowledged to have made himself known to men. Three special advantages of this form of revelation are then pointed out;—the development of our spiritual capabilities by the living embodiment of the laws of the spiritual life in the actions of Jesus Christ—actions which are at once manifestly human and indisputably divine;—the *touching and winning* motives for obeying these spiritual laws which abound in the personal history of the Saviour;—and the simplicity with which these laws and motives are presented equally and alike to human beings in every variety of grade, or culture, or time, or place. Regarding the distinctive characteristic of Christianity as 'a disclosure of the moral aspect of the Divine Being both as to his attributes and will, so far, at least, as it can affect man's interest and destiny, through the *medium of a human personage and life*,' we are prepared for the following quiet refutation of the sarcasm too familiar to certain lips and pens in disparagement of a 'Book Revelation':—

'It is no such thing—indeed, nothing, as it appears to us, but a preposterously shallow view of the whole subject could have so egregiously blundered upon this description of it. With just as much propriety might the ocean in which the Creator has gloriously mirrored his immensity and his power, be styled a *salt water revelation* of the Unseen. The book no more defines the mode of the display in

the one case, than salt water does in the other. Possibly had any superficial, but over-zealous advocate of the Christian faith adopted this method of depreciating the ocean as the glass of the Invisible, he would have been severely rebuked, and very justly, too, for a stolid dulness of apprehension in regard to the spirit of things material, or, more likely, for that intemperance of affection for a supernatural system which blinds the eyes of reason to the out-spread volume of nature. Is there not a possibility of fanaticism on the sceptical side? And may not even acute minds, under its influence, be led into marvellously childish and silly mistakes? Should we venture, on any other subject but Christianity, and in the name of intellectual philosophy, moreover, to set down as the descriptive and discriminating quality of the historical development of humanity, that it is one made by means of paper and print? And if not, why is Christianity to be thus misdescribed?—pp. 138—140.

It has always seemed to be a natural objection to the Christian revelation, or at any rate a difficulty connected with it, that its success is so incomplete. Mr. Miall meets this difficulty by showing that the same objection applies to every existing ground of religious faith, even that which builds on the discoveries of nature; that it bears equally against the provisions of the external world for the development of man's natural capacities;—that a general law of providential government, too vast for our comprehension, seems to be at work in all its other departments, as well as in this of revelation;—that the moral rule of the divine administration is not compulsory, but suasive;—that the employment of human agency appears to be the means most congruous with the avowed purpose of Christianity, which is an exhibition of God's character by means of human sympathy;—that this agency, here as elsewhere, is dealt with according to its own laws;—that the operation of these laws—freedom, responsibility, and mutual dependence—is to be traced in the entire history of the human race, as well as in the progress of Christianity;—that the incomplete success of Christianity hitherto, so far from being a reason for disbelieving it to be from God, may be of incalculable advantage to its complete triumph, in the progressive failure of every form of error by which it has been for a season obscured or hindered;—and that, however unaccountable to us the limits and the slowness of its success may be, immeasurably more unaccountable is the undeniable series of its achievements to this day. 'Let it be credited with its achievements as well as debited with its failures. The latter, perhaps, may be much more reasonably explained in connexion with the theory that it is divine than can the former on the supposition that it is not.'

The sum of the argument thus far is—the account which the Gospel gives of the origin of facts standing out on the broad

field of the world's history is not out of keeping with the analogies of truth; and the positive evidence of the gospels that this account is real and not fictitious claims to be examined, without prejudice, in its own proper light.

This positive evidence, under the quaint designation of 'The Seal,' occupies the Third Part of the treatise. It being settled that a revelation of God's moral perfections would be analogous to the revelation of those attributes which are illustrated in nature, and that there is nothing contrary to reason in making such a revelation through the medium of a human person and history, the nature of the case requires that the person through whom the revelation comes should have powers that are more than human to distinguish him from all others as *the* manifestation of God. The universally recognised manifestation of God is—Power. In no other way can we conceive of the indubitable token of the presence of God with a man. Hence the necessity of miracles. Miracles form a part of the revelation. They are inseparable from it—essential to it. They are *not the proofs of a doctrine*; they are attestations of a claim. If Jesus Christ raised the dead, he *was*, as He declared himself to be, the Son of God. This is a kind of proof which all can understand. It is, moreover, adapted to that instinctive love of the marvellous which seems to link our present state with one beyond us. It is the particular proof of a revelation from God which mankind have always looked for. It arouses the dormant attention of men. '*It was as the great bell of the universe, calling all men to worship and meditation.*'

The philosophical objections to miracles are then canvassed, and solutions are offered, which are well fitted to satisfy the class of minds for which the author has avowedly written. For the purpose of showing that miracles do not disturb the constancy of the character of God, he represents what a miracle is, as distinguished from a process of nature, examining the difference between the one and the other in relation to the principles which pervade the physical operations of the universe,—the *principle* of action being the same both in the natural and in the miraculous, though the *modes* of action in each case are different. We could not, without great risk of obscurity, epitomize the illustrations of this section, which we strenuously commend to the attention of our readers. We pass by the dissection of Mr. Hume's famous sophism on the credibility of miracles, merely suggesting that it would be an advantage to compare it with what Dr. Wardlaw has lately published on the same subject. Few of our readers, we think, will withhold their admiration from the following passages, in which Mr. Miall

exhibits the accordance of the miracles of Christianity with its avowed purpose.

‘In the *manner* of our Lord’s miracles there is a peculiarity which can hardly fail of having struck every candid and reflective mind. We know not that we can better indicate our meaning than by the homely expression—absence of fussiness. Their air is like that of the great works of God—sublimely quiet. We speak now, not so much of the tone of the narratives, as of the characteristics of the performances themselves therein recorded. The supernaturalism of the gospels is not a noisy, clattering, egotistic thing. It is calm as the falling of the dew, noiseless as the rising of the sun, modest and self-subdued as the starry heavens at midnight. There is a silence in it that awes, and a gentleness that startles, the soul. It fulfils its mission without preparation, or pomp, or parade. There is no bustle, no creaking of machinery, no well got-up theatrical surprises. The trumpet is never blown to call the world to witness it. The occasion usually turns up in the most incidental way. The deed is done without preluding flourishes meant to direct attention to the marvellousness of its character—and, if ever subsequently alluded to, is alluded to with a view to point a moral, or to enforce an admonition, not to sustain or exaggerate the wonder it produced. One sees nothing in the bearing of the worker of these miracles which seems to say of himself, ‘Well done!’—no traces of the lingering of his thoughts upon the feat—no peepings forth of self-satisfaction, as though it had been possible for him to have failed. Much as there is of the supernatural in Christ’s life, and unequivocal as it is, one cannot but feel surprised, if that which is recorded be true, that there was so little of it, and that little so retiring in its character. The power which is displayed speaks significantly of the power which was suffered to lie latent. After all, and in exquisite harmony with the entire purport of Christianity the Omnipotent is veiled. . . . Not only in manner, but in kind, are they becoming representatives of God. They have a moral aspect entirely in accordance with the tenour of the revelation of which they are assumed to be the seal. They exemplify very impressively the gentleness and benignity of Divine power. They all of them teach God’s sympathy with the suffering, God’s care for the wretched, God’s pity for the outcast. Throughout the life of Christ, wherever supernatural power is brought to bear upon man, it is invariably in tenderness. The leper, the lunatic, the maniac, the paralysed, the deaf and dumb, the blind, the dying and the dead—such are the subjects selected on whom to display the all-conquering energy of God.’—pp. 245—250.

From these natural views of the miracles of Jesus, the author makes an easy transition to the mythical theory of Strauss. To expose the worthlessness of that theory, he contrasts the actual narratives of the Gospel with those known pre-conceptions of the Jews which the myths are ingeniously imagined to have crys-

talized. By contrasting those narratives, in like manner, with all other reputed revelations from God, it is made to appear that they transcend the pre-conceptions of men in general no less than of the Jews in particular, in the benign and tender aspect so appropriate to the works of Him who came forth as the expression of the love of God to men.

The greatest of all the miracles—the resurrection of Jesus from the dead—is reported to us, as believed on the testimony of eye-witnesses, in documents unquestionably written before the death of Nero, and addressed to persons who knew that these witnesses had publicly declared their testimony, and who, indeed, were themselves bound together by the belief of this extraordinary fact. There can be no doubt that the men who gave this testimony themselves believed it. The supposition that it was not true involves us in greater difficulties than the belief that it was. Some of these difficulties are stated by the author in a manner which we presume most candid persons would acknowledge to be fair.

Though he does not *profess* to prove that Christianity is a divine revelation, he certainly shows that proof of the kind appropriate to the subject is offered—plain testimony to a broad fact by eye-witnesses of unimpeached competency and integrity; and that to their testimony the only semblance of objection is, that it involves a manifestation of supernatural power—that is, it involves the very thing without which there could be no revelation of the kind which Christianity professes to be; an objection of a singular kind, we must say; for, instead of repudiating the revelation because it is *not* proved, the objector refuses to accept the evidence, simply because it *does* prove it: a man could not have seen what he did see, because, forsooth, he could not have seen it unless there had been a miracle, though in a case where a miracle is in strict analogy with the tencour of all divine working, and indispensable to the particular work here ascribed to him!

The Fourth Part of the treatise relates to 'the Record.' Jesus Christ being described as Himself *the* revelation, the Bible is represented as 'not a revelation, but a *record* of one.' Without such a record the 'revelation' could have been only for one age and a limited number of men, unless there had been a perpetual miracle deviating more widely from the course of nature than all the recorded miracles combined. There is no reason for objecting to such a record. The greater part of our knowledge comes to us in the same way. Books are mighty movers of minds. As moral action is the best expression of moral sentiments, a book is the best record of moral actions. Not only so; but think of the ease with which a book is copied, carried from

place to place, accessible under nearly all circumstances, those especially in which the Christian revelation becomes most welcome and most soothing. A Scripture revelation, then, is not absurd.

As to the contents of the 'Record' the writer arranges them in two broad divisions—*statements of fact*, and *explanations of the spiritual bearing of fact*. On 'the statement of fact,' he is at great pains to urge that in dealing with this portion of the record—as the point in dispute between Christians and unbelievers—the question of 'inspiration' is beside the mark. He illustrates this assertion by picturing a Corinthian investigating the claims of the newly introduced faith, at the time when the documents on which we now rely had not yet made their appearance. He assumes that such an inquirer would not think of asking whether the witnesses or the reporters of the facts were inspired. He also expects it will be granted, that, apart from inspiration, an accurate report of these facts might be given; and that such reports by competent and reliable witnesses, assuming them to be the same in substance as those narrated by the evangelists, would have constituted as solid a basis for his belief in a divine revelation by Jesus Christ, as any which we possess in the present day. All the tests which would have been applicable to such supposed oral testimony—and no other tests—are fairly applicable to the written record. The first question, in each case alike, is—Do these facts morally demonstrate that Jesus Christ was what he declared himself to be? and the second question is,—Are the facts substantially proved? On these assumptions, the writer argues that, so long as criticism leaves the honesty and practical common sense of the writers of the gospels unshaken, it leaves 'untouched the foundations of a rational faith in Christianity as a revelation of God.' In this mode of simplifying the controversy with the unbeliever, we observe nothing different from the distribution of the argument by our ablest writers on the evidences of Christianity: they have uniformly established the *historical authority* of the Scriptures before they touched the question of their inspiration. Indeed we are at a loss to understand in what other way that question can be satisfactorily approached by a strictly reasoning mind. In like manner, an advocate of Christianity—as set forth in this volume—may demand of the critic of the New Testament that he shall not subject it to a process which would destroy all documentary history; that he should not come to it with the foregone conclusion, that it *cannot* be true; that he should look merely at the substance of what the narratives profess to be, overlooking all the national, local, and personal peculiarities of the narrators; and that he should distinguish

the reality of the facts reported both from the manner of reporting and from the implied beliefs of the reporter. On this fair requirement, as we cannot but deem it, that a narrative recording a revelation should be allowed to stand on the *universally accepted ground of historical evidence*, Mr. Miall affirms that the historical evidence in this case is even higher than in any other with which it could be compared.—We have not space for noticing the Seventh Section of this Part, entitled ‘Considerations Corroborative of the Authenticity of the Record suggested by the Probable Source of the First Three Gospels,’ further than to say, that it places a subject greatly clouded by conjecture in a somewhat interesting relation to his main object.

Besides the ‘Statement of Fact,’ the Record is described as containing ‘Explanations of the Spiritual Bearing of Fact.’ As the manifestations of God in Nature are interpreted by poets, ‘men of genius endowed with strong powers of insight into the true meaning of this wonderful exhibition,’ we are said to need men of ‘deep religious insight’ to interpret ‘the moral exhibition of God in his Son.’ The discernment of the spirit of nature is ‘God-given.’ ‘The power to read the high purport of revelation is also God-given.’ What the poet is to nature the ‘spiritual prophet’ is to ‘the harmonies of truth.’ The interpretative portion of the Record is spoken of as addressing our ‘religious consciousness’—the emotional element of our nature, as the historical portion does our ‘intellectual judgment.’ The ‘stamp of divinity,’ which interpreters of revelation must exhibit in their writing to our religious sense, are to be sought, we are told, in their religious character and their relation to Him whose system they expound; in the circumstances which prompted their effusions; in the correspondence of the general views they maintain with the entire body of facts to which they relate; and in the congruity of their expositions of the purport of those facts with the instinctive spiritual wants of our own nature. Each of these requirements is set forth with much copiousness of illustration. The writer treads delicate ground with a firm step, and deals both in thoughts and expressions which will expose him to the animadversion of many, with whom it is probable that he substantially agrees on all that they hold to be essential in their theology.

The most careful attention we are able to give to this part of his book, in connexion with the main object, while far from yielding us entire satisfaction, does not warrant us to call in question his belief that ‘the writers of the New Testament were inspired of God.’ The method he has followed in this volume required him to pursue what he judged to be a better course than reiterating that assertion in the hearing of intelligent

inquirers pursuing religious truth. Whether it be really a 'better course' or not will be judged of differently by different persons, perhaps even among those to whom the fact so asserted is beyond question. There is nothing in the volume from which we infer that the writer is not as earnest as he certainly is painstaking in the advocacy of the gospel as a message of salvation from God. On the contrary, the structure of his work, and its pervading tone, deserve our respect for the independence with which he decides, and the perspicuity with which his decisions are avowed, even when those avowals are not such as we should ourselves have made.

On the distinction between 'religious insight' and 'intellectual processes,' Mr. Miall has written a section not without its uses, but requiring to be read with the same allowance for his specific object, which we have just been showing to be reasonable. In addressing sceptics, it is a palpable advantage to have the ground as clear as possible of collateral disputes, not by concealment—not by compromise—not by logical subtlety—not by rhetorical artifice, but by keeping singly and straight along the line of argument professedly in hand. Some sceptical objections become more deeply fixed by well-meant but not skilful attempts to remove them. None but the least intelligent Christians ever imagine that the inspiration which qualified the disciples of Jesus to expound the divine lessons, comprised in this wonderful history, necessarily included the perfection of every other kind of knowledge. It is enough that they did thus know 'the truth' which they were commissioned to teach. Let the candid doubter meet the candid believer on this common admission, that there *may* be *superhuman* insight into the spiritual truth revealed through the history of Christ which is not to be confounded with intellectual processes, and not a few of the perplexities supposed to lie on the surface of the New Testament will at once disappear. And if a candid believer and a candid sceptic will take the common ground that diverse aspects of a revealed truth, and diverse forms of representing it, *may* co-exist with perfect identity in the truth thus variously exhibited, neither the one nor the other will imagine real inconsistency in the separate expositions of James and John, of Peter, and Jude, and Paul. The divine power of the truth is not constituted, nor is it counteracted, by the several mental idiosyncrasies, or the varying special aims and circumstances, of these apostolic writers.

We observe that the author refers in his preface to 'The Eclipse of Faith,' and to Dr. Wardlaw on 'Miracles,' as works which he had abstained from reading. He has, doubtless, had the satisfaction already of seeing that neither of these publications can possibly be said to have anticipated his own. 'The

Restoration of Belief,' we have lately noticed as a noble production, to which, we are glad to see, Mr. Miall refers with approbation.

Though we refrain from offering such strictures as might be construed into a want of confidence in the writer's main argument, we should have unworthily disguised our judgment had we not expressed some want of satisfaction with the style in which the author deals with inspiration. We think he has said too much for the mere purpose of simplifying his argument—not enough to separate him from a school of writers among whom some of the phrases and turns of thought which we regret to find in his pages are perpetually used, in a sense opposed to what most Christians understand by 'Christianity as a Divine Revelation.' Mr. Miall's *restricted* and *exclusive* use of the latter word is not that of the New Testament writers; the difference is, to us, not an affair of taste or convenience, but of principle. The presentation of Jesus Christ to the men of Palestine, of which we have both the record and the explanation in the New Testament, is not spoken of by himself or by his disciples as '*The Revelation*;' but both the Lord and the disciples do speak of truths being *revealed* to certain minds. We think it safe to abide by 'the record.' We doubt not that God is revealed to man in Jesus Christ; but *the teaching of the apostles* is spoken of by themselves in terms which assure us that they were commissioned to make known truths which they had learned from God. Whatever a Corinthian inquirer may have thought of the elements of testimony on which it might be safe to build his faith, the sublime teacher who planted the Corinthian church is most careful to assert,—not that God had revealed his moral attributes to our religious consciousness in the human life of Jesus,—not that himself and the other apostles addressed the emotional rather than the logical element of our nature, and 'that by it chiefly the final verdict must be given,'—not that 'they had that best of interpretative faculties, sympathy with the author whose volume of deeds and sufferings it was given them to explain,'—not that their religious character and their relation to Christ and to his church secured their perfect intelligence of the Gospel,—nor the correspondence of their 'general views' with the entire body of facts to which they relate,—nor the congruity of their interpretation with the 'religious consciousness of men,'—but that 'God hath *revealed* them to us by His SPIRIT.' We have the same evidence of *this* revelation that we have of any other of the miracles recorded in the New Testament. All that Mr. Miall has taught respecting the writers of the record, we accept as true; but not as the whole truth on this subject.

The distinction, much insisted on by Schleiermacher and other philosophical divines of Germany between the 'logical' and 'the emotional' is older than philosophy, and is of confessed practical importance, yet it is of no service whatever to us in discriminating 'the statement of facts' from the 'interpretation' of them in the New Testament. The 'intellectual judgment' is *not* addressed in the 'historical portion of the record' in any sense which excludes 'the emotional element' of our nature; that portion, even according to Mr. Miall's showing throughout his Second Part, appeals to our moral sympathies *through* our intellectual perception of facts; and we submit that our intellectual judgment is perpetually addressed by the apostles, for the purpose of interpreting the facts so exhibited. We recognise no *verdict* that is not given by the *judgment*—however readily we own the vital importance—the preponderating weight—of the moral emotions in enabling us to *appreciate* the truth of the revelations made by the Holy Spirit. We hold to 'The Record' as being, to *us*, a series of revelations, because, as we understand the apostles, this is what they believed and taught. There is a note in Mr. Miall's volume (p. 318) in which he declares his 'own unfaltering belief that the writers of New Testament history *were* under divine guidance in composing their several memoirs of Christ;' while contending that no more is required in the record of facts by the evangelists, than such evidences of historical trustworthiness as suffice in other cases, he adds, that 'more than this is forthcoming on demand' (p. 350); and, though he repeatedly affirms that the inspiration of the apostles 'in the modern understanding of the term,' may be safely treated as an open question, *in this particular argument*, he nowhere insinuates that the question, *in other respects*, is either unimportant or incapable of being determined; still less does he encumber his reasoning by hinting at speculations of his own regarding it. It cannot be requisite for us to say that the inspiration of the Scriptures is an essential element in our Christian belief, a principle which, on proper occasions, we are prepared to defend, as we have ever done, with the gravest earnestness. We do not know precisely what Mr. Miall means by the 'modern understanding of the term inspiration;' and we will not violate the fairness of criticism by giving to his words an interpretation which he might disown. His book will do good in the direction at which he aims. We consider that he has made out what he intended to show:—'that the proof tendered on behalf of the Gospel is of a kind which true philosophy is bound to accept.' The author intimates that he has laid his account with 'uncharitable suspicions.' Should any be expressed,

we have no doubt the simplicity of his argument will more than compensate him for whatever inconvenience they may occasion: he may assure himself that we are unconscious of that kind of feeling in the suggestions we have made, and made the more frankly, for the high opinion we entertain of the skilful adaptation of the book to its own specific object. We invite those who may have been moved by modern insinuations against Christianity to the study of a work which bears on its face such indubitable evidence, not only of mental power, but of intelligence, fair dealing, deliberate conviction, and temperateness both of argument and of spirit; and we sincerely thank the writer for the timely service he has rendered to the majesty of truth, and to the imperishable interests of mankind.

ART. V.—*The Recommendations of the University Commissioners, with Selections from their Report, and a History of the Subscription Tests, &c.* By James Heywood, Esq., M.P., F.R.S., &c. 8vo. London: Longman and Co. 1853.

No man in England has made sacrifices of time and money for the cause of University Reform to compare with Mr. James Heywood. The works which he has written, caused to be written, translated or edited, will fill a little shelf. The subject has been a labour of love to him; and when Lord John Russell, at his motion in the House of Commons, freely consented to the appointment of a Royal Commission of Visitation, the unexpected success after tedious disappointments was gained so quietly and easily, that the public at large little knew the importance of the victory, and how hardly it had been earned. In the vulgar eye Mr. Heywood's labours have received no blazonry, and are generally unknown. Although we believe that he finds his full reward in the now hopeful state of affairs, and that if real reform be carried, he will be satisfied to have his part in the work forgotten, we gladly seize the opportunity of acknowledging the merit of his services.

The volume before us contains, as original matter, a Preface of 28 pages, and a History of the Tests, &c. in 122 pages. But it is probable that Mr. Heywood's main object has been to make the most important part of the great Blue Book concerning Oxford accessible to the public. His selections appertain peculiarly to the colleges, in contrast to the University, and are beyond question, to the public at large, by far the most interesting part of that valuable production.

We so recently reviewed the Report of the Oxford Commission, that we are debarred altogether from treating here of the chief part of Mr. Heywood's volume, which we cordially recommend to the study of the curious, and of practical reformers. The volume ought certainly to be in the library of every dissenting academy, and (we are much disposed to add) of every master of an endowed school. In fact it is our earnest hope and belief that new thoughts of great moment, as to the *material* of general education, are destined to pervade all our schools in the course of not many years. It is widely felt that Greek, Latin, and mathematics are too exclusive, too peculiar, a form of instruction, to be imposed on every mind, without reference to personal taste or talent, after-prospects, or the length of time which can possibly be devoted to such studies. The accumulations of knowledge in modern literature and science,—the grand productions of genius, so various in kind—do not deserve to be degraded in rank as compared with the very limited literature extant to us from Greece and Rome. To reorganise our schools, so as to meet the new state of things, is a vast work, and can only be gradual; but the soener schoolmasters discern that it is inevitable, and that preparation must be made for it, the better for them and for the public.

It is not easy to exhaust all the consequences which may be hoped to flow out of that extension of academical studies which will react upon the schools; but there is one part of the topic, to which, in our opinion, due attention has never yet been paid,—we mean the reform of the subjects taught in the endowed grammar-schools. This cannot be done without direct parliamentary interference;—for if the Court of Chancery could give permission, it would not, unless hard pressed by unanimous application; which it will not be. Public opinion has to be formed on the subject, and being formed, will in time act through parliament. The case is this, the endowed grammar-schools were intended for the benefit of *the poor*, and as a basis of truly national education. The direction of their studies to *Latin* grammar as the essential basis, rose out of the fact that Latin literature was then the most accessible of all existing literatures of value. But now, the effect is, that the funds (which have for the most part much increased) are no longer available for the poorest classes; or, instead of raising those classes, act merely to drain off from them their most forward and energetic minds, which pass through the gate of the Universities into more aristocratic circles, and seldom or never retain any congeniality with the classes from which they sprang, whatever may be their purely domestic piety. We fear to be invidious in mentioning names; but when we try to recount the men

who have risen from low origin to superior station *in or through* our old universities, we cannot find one of them who may be said to have popular principles. We have to look there to men of rather higher, sometimes of really aristocratic, birth, if we would find those who desire to raise the lowest classes, morally, intellectually, socially, and politically. Now this surely is a capital blunder in the actual working of our grammar-schools, that instead of raising the poorest class, their whole tendency (more or less energetic) is, to remove from it the very men who ought to improve it. If we desire to elevate the mass of a nation, we must, no doubt, allow able persons to rise to eminence out of the lowest classes; but by no means encourage separating them locally in early youth from their natural connexions, which inevitably destroys their will and power to sympathize with their original order. A boy of superior talent, who becomes skilled in Latin and Greek, or in Cambridge Mathematics, has no natural career opened to him beyond by it, *except* by going to Oxford or Cambridge; which is generally recommended and often aided by kind persons. But this, if good for the individual, is scarcely good for his class which remains behind him. If, on the contrary, the things taught in these endowed schools were such as prepared a boy for every kind of higher service in his own neighbourhood, in the first place they would attract the masses of the people in a manner which is now impossible; in the second place, they would have far more chance of retaining higher minds in contact and in affection with their own order. Instead of aspiring to become humble companions, or it may be humble slaves, of aristocrats, they would manifest themselves as, what God intended them to be, the natural aristocracy of their own people, and would impart to them elevation and refinement. We feel no doubt whatever that all the funds of all the endowed schools of the kingdom ought to be treated as a national trust, to be locally managed, under general regulations, for free instruction, without any regard to the restrictions of *Latin grammar* or other well-meant enactments of founders.

This whole question of Founders' Wills is so well argued in the Oxford Report, that there is great hope of its stopping the mouth of even Sir Robert Inglis; at any rate, of its convincing parliament. At present, either foundation-deeds or custom very generally enforces, that the masters of grammar-schools shall be Masters of Arts from Oxford or Cambridge. It will, therefore, be of great importance for such schools, that more enlarged conceptions of intellectual accomplishment should prevail in those Universities. And, in fact, all the leading minds in both of them are convinced. It is only needed for parliament to *permit* the academical action from within to repeal those

statutes, oaths, or laws which *forbid* their voluntary improvement,—and the most powerful minds in the Universities will do everything of themselves. This is a most hopeful position of things, and we trust due use will be made of it by the present ministry. If they propose a bold, decisive cutting away of all the shackles which now bind academicians, they will encounter none but a self-stultifying opposition. But if they so dread innovation, as to propose only small palliatives for existing inefficiency, and try to enforce those palliatives, they will have tenfold opposition, and little fruit if successful. We will hope better things, for the right course seems plain enough.

Mr. Heywood's history of the Tests and of the numerous royal and parliamentary interpositions, is directed (like the history of the Universities by Huber, on which he was so munificently lavish) to exhibit in tangible shape the extreme absurdity of academical outeries against 'unconstitutional' interference. In fact, of all corporations in the kingdom there are none in which the interposition of the central authority is so appropriate and so necessary. The corporation of London, or of Bristol, or of the town of Oxford, might proudly say, that their powers are self-derived, and are the *source* from which those of parliament have flowed. The House of Commons has collective rights over all England, *because* its members represent the will of the parts of England. But the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge have no local and natural root. Their members are furnished from all England. Their legal rights have been granted by the free will of kings or parliaments, for the sake of the general good of the nation (as that was apprehended), and may at any time be modified or withdrawn by the same power, and for the same end. But we believe this battle has not to be fought again, and perhaps we waste words in adverting to it. We may be forgiven in a little theoretical jealousy for local rights, which leads us to protest, that in justifying the most unceremonious interference of parliament, to any extent which it thinks desirable, with institutions purely national, like the Universities,—so far as to annihilate them, if requisite,—we do not uphold the general principles of central absolutism, or imagine that parliament could, without a constitutional usurpation, supersede the functions of institutions which are strictly local. But indeed practically, alike towards Universities or Municipalities, the relation of the more central authority is simply this,—it has to secure that the subordinate institution shall perform its duties energetically, and observe all the general principles and rights which pervade English life. Among these we are entitled to reckon,—that no arbitrary disabilities be inflicted on classes of men, neither on account of their

place of birth, nor the character of their religious conviction. The existing religious ordinances at the old Universities are a remnant of the persecuting enactments carried after the Restoration. That they were not repealed at the Revolution is, in no small measure, attributable to the self-denial of protestant dissenters, who preferred to be excluded themselves, rather than encounter the risk (as they viewed it) of admitting papists. Those times are passed. The restrictions are removed in parliament,—in the privy council,—in the cabinet,—in the municipalities. Popery *from without* is no longer the danger to England, but popery *within* the favoured church, and dominant by its means in the Universities. The country has waited patiently while the Puseyite problem worked its own solution. What was known at first to the few, is now manifest to the many;—*Puseyism is Romanism in preparation or in disguise*. We have a right to claim that the church's monopoly in the Universities and colleges shall be overthrown, not for the sake of dissenters, but for the national welfare, and for the maintenance of good faith.

Mr. Heywood has printed in his volume the Thirty-Nine Articles and several of the Canons, for the sake of dissenters, we suppose, who have no prayer books. He has also here given a permanent place to an elaborate petition from Manchester for University Reform, in 1844; which deserves remark on account of its date, and the extensive agreement between its statements and arguments, and those of the recent Oxford commission. If we could hope for any self-consistency in the Earl of Derby, his present position as Chancellor of Oxford, elected by the special favour of the most thorough-going Tories there, might seem an advantage in the question of repealing religious tests: for in 1834 the noble lord (then Lord Stanley) was decidedly in favour of the admission of dissenters to the Universities; a fact which Mr. Heywood takes care shall not be forgotten.

In conclusion, we have only to express our hope, that this volume may do all the service which its liberal author desires.

ART. VI.—*Dissenters' Places of Worship.* Return to an Order of the Honourable the House of Commons, dated 11th February, 1853.

2. *An Act to Amend the Law relating to Certifying and Registering Places of Religious Worship of Protestant Dissenters.* 15 and 16 Vict., c. 36, 30th June, 1852.

3. *Bill to Amend the Law concerning the Certifying and Registering of Places of Religious Worship in England.*

IN the year 1836, the Hon. Arthur Trevor, then member of Parliament for Durham, moved an 'Address in the House of Commons for a Return of the Number of the Registered Dissenting Meeting-houses and Roman-catholic chapels in England and Wales.' If it was his object to ascertain from such Return either the comparative numerical strength of the Dissenters, or the extent of the provision of religious instruction by them supplied, or, in fact, whatever information he sought for, he must have been completely disappointed by the result. The Returns (ordered by the House of Commons to be printed July 14th, 1836) were, for the most part, extremely imperfect, and showed only that no care whatever had been taken in the majority of cases to preserve the records, even when the directions of the 52 Geo. III. c. 155 had been complied with. In the 'Eclectic Review' for January 1837, will be found an article upon the subject, in which the defectiveness of these Returns is thoroughly exposed. Protestant Dissenters, it was then remarked, had great reason to complain of the gross and wilful negligence on the part of the ecclesiastical registrars and clerks of the peace, which was thus brought to light; and some legislative remedy seemed imperatively demanded in order to protect Dissenters against the consequences of this neglect. 'Either the penal statutes against conventicles, hitherto only conditionally repealed, should be absolutely and completely abrogated, or a new system of certifying and registering dissenting places of worship ought to be adopted. Nor do we see any objection to requiring, that every place of worship now in use should be forthwith certified to the several clerks of the peace, or to the superintendent registrars under the new *Registration Act*, to whom the ecclesiastical registrars would doubtless be glad to relinquish this somewhat unpalatable part of their official duty. We trust that this subject will be taken up in the next session of parliament.'

The suggestion, alas! fell unheeded upon the Dissenting public, who would probably never have stirred in the matter to

the present moment, had not a right reverend prelate been induced to bring forward a Bill, having for its object to relieve the ecclesiastical registrars from all responsibility for the past, and all trouble for the future, in regard to these records. About this time last year, we were startled at finding announced as laid upon the table of the House of Lords, by the Lord Bishop of Salisbury, a 'Dissenters' Chapels Bill.' Not being aware that that prelate had ever exhibited any special benevolence towards Dissenters, or that he had been applied to by them to legislate on their behalf, we felt no small curiosity to ascertain the nature of the measure, which proved to be a Bill 'to amend the law relating to certifying and registering places of worship of Protestant Dissenters.' The Bill, as it came down to the Commons, after reciting the 1 Wm. and Mary, sess. 1, c. 18, and 52 Geo. III. c. 155, simply enacted, that no such 'places of meeting' should in future be certified to or registered in the court of any bishop or archdeacon; leaving matters as they stood with regard to the certifying to, and registering by, justices of the peace at general and quarter sessions, and clerks of the peace, and making no provision for the due preservation of the registers. We do not blame the Bishop of Salisbury for this. It was not his business to concern himself with a matter affecting the Dissenters, respecting which they had shown so complete indifference; and we cannot suppose that any of their lordships felt particular anxiety to obtain a correct return of the numbers of Dissenting places of worship. When, however, the Bill was brought down to the Commons, the attention of the Metropolitan Committee of Protestant Dissenting Deputies was called to the measure; and it was at once perceived to be a fitting opportunity for doing away with the former vexatious and useless system of registry altogether, by introducing words extending the provision relating to bishops' and archdeacons' registrars to quarter sessions and clerks of the peace, and transferring their duties as registrars to the Registrar General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages. The Committee found, however, that they had been anticipated by the vigilance of a gentleman warmly interested in the effective working of the Registration system, who had already put himself in communication with Mr. Bright, and at whose request the honourable Member proposed an amendment to that effect; to which, it is but justice to acknowledge, Mr. Secretary Walpole readily assented. Moreover, a clause was added in the Commons, providing that the Registrar General shall in every year make out and cause to be printed, a list of all existing certified places of worship, stating the denomination to which it belongs; copies of such list to be sent to every

superintendent registrar, which shall be open to all persons desirous of inspecting the same. With these amendments, and a clause fixing the fee for the certificate of registration at 2s. 6d., the Bill passed, and received the royal assent, June 30th 1852. (15 and 16 Vict. c. 36.)

Unfortunately, in the process of amendment, some words were struck out of the first clause, which required other words to be inserted in lieu of them, to the effect, that all certificates shall be of the same force as if the place of meeting mentioned therein had been originally certified to the *Registrar General*. The consequence of this blunder has been, to render the Act void; and hence the necessity for the amended Bill introduced by Viscount Palmerston, which is now before the Commons, and to which, as embracing some other important provisions, we have to call the especial attention of our readers.

Before, however, we advert to its proposed enactments, we must offer a few remarks upon the valuable Return which, on the motion of Mr. Bright, has just been laid on the table of the House of Commons; being a summary and analysis of the Returns made to the Registrar General in pursuance of a provision of the Act of last session, requiring the registrar of every bishop and archdeacon, and the clerk of the peace of every county, division, or town, to make a return to the Registrar General of all places of meeting certified in their courts or offices respectively, up to the passing of the Act.

For the extent of the information supplied by the Returns so obtained, and laboriously analyzed by Mr. Mann, the Chief Clerk, the public are indebted to the admirable 'Instructional Circulars' and Form of Return prepared and issued by direction of the Registrar General. The registrars and clerks of the peace were given to understand that the Return required was 'not to consist of a bare *enumeration* of all the certified places of worship' in their diocese or district, but must contain 'such a descriptive reference to *each* as will suffice to identify and distinguish it from other similar places therein, and thus enable the Registrar General to ascertain, by inquiry, which of those places, on account of their having *wholly ceased* to be used for public religious worship, ought to be expunged from the nominal list of *existing* certified places, which it will be his duty to prepare and publish annually, pursuant to the Act.' It was owing, at least in part, to the absence of any such clear and intelligent instructions, that the Return made in 1836 was so completely worthless, except as disclosing the inattention paid to the directions of the existing statutes. Some instances of sheer carelessness in that Return are brought to light, indeed, in the present. Thus, the clerk of the peace for Hertfordshire

stated, in the Return of 1836, that dissenting chapels were seldom registered with the clerk of the peace; and he did not find any document with the records to enable him to make with any accuracy the Return required. Now, in the present Return, the clerk of the peace for that county enumerates 130 certified places between 1689 and 1851, being such only as were 'certified direct to the court of quarter sessions.' Again, the clerk of the peace for Bucks, in 1836, very laconically says,—'I have no record in my office of any licenses being granted within the county of Bucks, for any dissenting meeting-house or Roman-catholic chapel.' In the present Return, twenty-three places are returned as certified *since* 1791; and 'Mr. Tindal considers it to have been the general rule, to register these certificates in the Archdeaconry Court of Buckingham, and that the few which have been recorded with the clerk of the peace, as shown in the Return, form exceptions to the general practice.' It is not at all probable that no such 'exceptions' occurred prior to 1791. On turning to the former Return from the Archdeaconry Court of Bucks, we read as follows:—'The total number of houses registered in the said court as places for religious worship by Protestant dissenters from the Church of England is 602. No places of worship for Roman-catholics have been registered.' In the present Return, the number of places certified in this Archdeaconry Court is seven hundred and ninety-one; but the registrar 'has no record of certificates prior to 1781,' and the return comprises only places certified in his own court. Hence it appears, that the registers from 1689 to 1781—nearly a hundred years—have been destroyed. Now, in Buckinghamshire, the Society of Friends, who have always been particularly attentive to the registration of their places of meeting, (and with good reason,) were, in earlier times, very numerous, and yet, no record has been preserved! In the General Summary, the total number of certified places in the county of Bucks is 841; namely, 617 'temporary,' and 224 'permanent,' but none are included that were certified prior to 1781. In the Summary arranged according to the Denominations, the Quakers appear as having, in the whole county, only one 'temporary,' and one 'permanent place of meeting.' In the county of Norfolk, also, they have registered only two 'temporary,' and one 'permanent!'

In the Archdeaconry Court of Norwich, 'there are no entries to be found in the registrar's books of an earlier date than 1752.' The total number of places certified during the last hundred years is 4108; an increase upon the return of 1836 of 753, exclusive of 44 registered at Ipswich by the deputy re-

gistrar. From the clerk of the peace for Norfolk, the return is 'nil,' accompanied with the following pithy statement: 'I find no record in my office of any Protestant dissenting, or other place of religious worship having been certified to the justices of the peace for the county of Norfolk under the acts of 1 William and Mary, c. 18, and 52 Geo. III. c. 155, or either of them.'* Of the places certified to the Archdeaconry Court of Norwich, it appears, 2942 are in the county of Norfolk, and 1159 in Suffolk. To these are to be added 47 certified (between 1689 and 1841) to the clerk of the peace for the city of Norwich. The county of Norfolk was a nursery of early nonconformity; yet, *no records have been preserved of any places of worship certified during the first sixty years after the passing of the Toleration Act.* The total number certified in this county is 2989; of which 2374 are 'temporary,' and 615 'permanent,' all dating since 1781.

The following curious memorandum, entered in the Register-book of Licenses of the Diocese of Ely, between the years 1761 and 1781, will show how distasteful to the ecclesiastical authorities was the duty which they found themselves under the legal necessity of discharging:—

'On Monday, 30th Nov., 1761, Dr. Mason, Fellow of Trinity College, at the office, said, it was very wrong in granting licenses to meeting-houses in the manner as practised, and that the bishop should always be acquainted with the certificate before any license granted, &c. Dr. Mason said, he would write to the bishop, and inform his lordship how irregular the licenses for meeting-houses were granted, and desired a copy of the license granted to John Farrow, of Orwell, on 18th April, 1761, which he had, &c.

'N.B. Not to grant any more licenses for meeting-houses without express orders from the bishop, &c.

'To tell such people as apply to the bishop's office for licenses for meeting-houses, to apply to the Justices at the Quarter Sessions.

'As the granting the license to the Independents is a matter of compulsion from the law, if they have not taken one out at the Quarter Sessions, you may send to them and grant it as they desire.

I am, Your faithful Servant,

'London, May 1st, 1781.

EDM. ELY.'

* Mr. Francis, 'Deputy Registrar,' Norwich, also states that,—'No places of public worship appear ever to have been certified or registered in the Court of Registry of the Archdeacon of the Archdeaconry of Norfolk under the acts of Wm. and Mary, and 52 Geo. III.' And Mr. Edward Steward, 'Deputy Registrar,' Newark, begs to say, 'that it has not been the practice in the diocese of Norwich to certify to the archdeacon places of meeting of dissenting congregations, nor to register the same.'

Strictly speaking, these certificates were not 'licenses,' which is an ecclesiastical term inapplicable to dissenting places of worship, the only design of the certificate being to secure the civil liberty and legal protection of the parties applying for the certification of the place.

How many places of worship certified between 1689 and 1750 are still in existence and used for religious purposes, it is impossible to ascertain; nor is it of much importance, except as it would throw some light upon the spread and progress of Non-conformity in the period immediately following upon the passing of the Toleration Act, before Methodism, under any of its phases or denominations, or any of the more eccentric varieties of sectarianism, had sprang into existence. Some of the earlier registries that have been preserved, are highly curious and interesting. In some instances, a number of places of meeting are certified in one locality, and under the name of one individual; indicating, we suspect, the activity of persecution, or exposure to annoyance, which rendered it necessary to certify every dwelling-house or room in which even a prayer-meeting was held, in order to secure exemption from disturbance or penalties. A very considerable number of such 'temporary places' of meeting have, of course, been long disused; but many which are so described in the returns made to the Registrar General, are doubtless permanent places of worship. All places have been classified by the Registrar General as 'temporary,' which, in the returns, are wholly undescribed (amounting to 514), and as to which, therefore, it could not be certainly predicated, that any of them are permanent places of worship; as well as all which were found to be certified under the name or designation of—

'Academy, apartment, ark, auction-mart, baptistry, barn, brewery, building (part of), camp, chamber, close, cockpit, corn exchange, cottage, dwelling, dwelling-house, erection, field, forest, forge, garden, granary, green, ground (piece of), hall (*e. g.*, market-hall, temperance-hall), hovel, house (*e. g.*, farm-house, pen-house), institution, kitchen, land, laundry, lodge, loft, marquee, messuage, mill, office, orchard, out-building, plantation, preaching-house, premises, rooms (*e. g.*, assembly-room, school-room), seamen's chapel, shed, ship, shop, stable, tabernacle, tent, theatre, workhouse, yard.'

In rejecting all places so designated from the number of permanent places, the Registrar General has exercised a sound discretion, although, in many of the returns of earlier date, places are found to have been very frequently described by the general term 'house,' many of which were doubtless 'meeting-houses.' 'Preaching-house,' also, probably denotes a permanent place of meeting. Some of the above designations ap-

pear to have been applied to the place certified, in derision; such as 'hovel,' 'shed,' 'shop.' Others may be specific names of rented buildings; as, in London, some of our older places of Nonconformist worship were known under the designation of Pinner's Hall, Salter's Hall, Haberdashers' Hall, the Weigh-house; and 'yard,' or 'green,' would probably intend a meeting-house built on such yard or green, as 'Unicorn-yard (*i. e.*, chapel), &c. The aggregate number of places comprised in this return, is:—

'Houses, dwelling-houses, rooms, or other (supposed)	
temporary buildings	39,817
Chapels, buildings, meeting-houses, or other (supposed)	
permanent places	14,987
Total certified	
	54,804

Of the 39,817 temporary, 27,291 have been certified since 1800; and of the 14,987, 13,143; making 40,434 of the 54,804. But this aggregate, it is remarked, 'does not furnish any safe basis for estimating the number of Dissenting and Roman-catholic places of worship now actually *in use*. 'All that can, with certainty, be here stated upon that point, is, that at the census of 1851, returns as to accommodation and attendance were obtained by the Registrar General from upwards of 20,400 places of worship *not belonging to the Established Church* of England; of which number nearly 17,000 were stated to be "separate" buildings, the remainder being either described as "not separate," or not described at all. Of these 17,000 separate buildings, 3342 are registered for the solemnization of marriage, under the act 6 & 7 William IV. c. 85.'

This number of separate places of Nonconformist worship far exceeds any estimate which Protestant Dissenters have hitherto ventured to adopt. Mr. Edward Baines, in his evidence before the Select Committee on Church-rates, put in a return, carefully compiled from the best documents to which he had access, in which the total number of Nonconformist chapels in England and Wales was estimated at 14,340, and the 'preaching stations,' in school-rooms, hired rooms, &c., at 7472; total, 21,812. It is evident, that he underrated the number of 'separate' buildings; and there is every reason to conclude, that he has not exceeded the truth in the aggregate number. The following 'summary,' in the present Return, exhibits the total number of the places of worship certified under the various designations of the religious denominations to which they belong:—

Designation.	Houses, rooms, or Temporary Buildings.	Chapels, or Permanent Buildings.	Total.
Protestants and Protestant Dissenters	20,655 ...	6,578 ...	27,233
Presbyterians	583 ...	150 ...	733
Independents or Congregationalists...	2,470 ...	1,469 ...	3,939
Baptists, General and Particular ...	1,723 ...	1,001 ...	2,724
Quakers	657 ...	203 ...	860
Wesleyan, Primitive, and other Ar- minian Methodists	1,866 ...	2,035 ...	3,901
Calvinistic Methodists	18 ...	84 ...	102
Roman Catholics	118 ...	374 ...	492
Other specified denominations	524 ...	346 ...	870
Denominations not specified	11,203 ...	2,747 ...	13,950
Total	39,817	14,987	54,804

As the first designation, 'Protestants and Protestant Dissenters,' may include places belonging to different denominations, it is impossible to ascertain from this table the comparative numbers of the chapels belonging to the different bodies; but, as the Wesleyans and other Methodists rarely describe themselves as Dissenters, we may assume, that the 6578 'Protestant Dissenters' chapels belong, for the most part, to the 'Independents' and 'Baptists.' This will explain how the chapels of these two denominations, estimated by Mr. Baines at 4515, appear in the Return as only 2470. The chapels of the Wesleyan and other Methodists must be greatly understated under that specific head. Mr. Baines estimates them as under:

	Chapels.	Preaching-rooms.
Wesleyan	4450	1101
Methodist New Connexion	281	100
Wesleyan Methodist Association...	322	185
Primitive Methodist	1662	3593
Total	6715	4979
Total	11,694	

The classified summary gives only 3901. The discrepancy may probably be accounted for by the large number (13,950) under the head, 'denominations not specified;' but, in that case, a large proportion of Wesleyan 'chapels' must class under 'temporary buildings.' The Calvinistic Methodists, so numerous in Wales, have nearer 900 than 100 places of worship; but we have reason to suspect that they have been remiss in duly certifying them; and none appear to have been certified prior to 1800.

The Roman Catholics, to whom Mr. Baines assigns 597 chapels, appear in the Return to have only 374 certified as permanent or separate, and 118 not separate buildings; together, 492.

The columns headed, 'Other specified Denominations,' we are told, include all places certified by denominations or societies who are thus described in the returns made to the Registrar General—

'Aitkin's Christian Instruction Society, Arminians, Arminian

Bible Christians, Baptized Protestants, Baxterians, Bethel Union Society, Bible Christians, Brethren, Bryanites, Calvinists, Chartist Religionists, Children of Sion, Church of Sion, Church of England, Christian Believers, Christian Bond Society, Christian Pilgrims, Christian Revivalists, Christians, Christian Society, Christian Society of Harmony, Christian Union, Countess of Huntingdon's Persuasion, Disciples of Christ, Dissenters, Evangelical Arminians, Episcopalians, Established Church, Evangelical Unionists, Followers of Peace, Free Thinking Christians, Friendly Society, Holy and Apostolic Church, Home Missionaries, Huntingtonians, Independent Bible Christians, Independent Millenarians, Jews, Latter Day Saints, Millenarians, Moravians, Mormonites, New Church, New Jerusalem Church, New Jerusalemites, Peculiar Calvinists, Philadelphians, Plymouth Brethren, Primitive Christian Dissenters, Providence Society, Providence Union Society, Ranters, Rational Religionists, Revivalist Community, Sandemanians, Seceders, Separatists, Shilohites, Social Institution, Sons of Sion, Southcottonians, Trinitarians, Unitarians, Unitas Fratrum, United Brethren, United Friends, Universalists, Universal Millenarian Church.'

We cannot find fault with the Registrar General for giving these 'specifications' as they appear in the returns transmitted to him; although it is manifest, that, of the sixty-seven 'denominations,' a very slender degree of information is required to explode the greater number. The 'Jews' ought to find distinct enumeration.* 'Church of England,' and 'Established Church' cannot correctly designate non-established places of worship. Some of the designations are obviously synonymes. Thus, the New Jerusalem Church appears under two or three *aliases*. The ancient Episcopal Church of the 'United Brethren' is designated under that title both in Latin and in English, and also as Moravians. The Bryanites should have been classified with Primitive Methodists; 'Countess of Huntingdon's Persuasion,' under 'Calvinistic Methodists;' 'Baptized Protestant,' under Baptists; 'Dissenters,' under Protestant Dissenters; 'Home Missionaries,' under the denomination to which they belong, and which the certificate ought to have shown. Some of the designations have no better claim to be accepted as religious denominations, than would those of any lodge of Odd Fellows, benefit society, or temperance society. We have no doubt that, in future, the Registrar General will give instructions that will prevent, as far as possible, the scandal arising to religion itself from some of these ignorant or wilfully misleading and ridiculous certifications. It is some satisfaction to find, that to these 67 denominations, only 346 chapels of the 15,000 are assigned; and a proper distribution would reduce them, probably, to a fourth of that number. Some of them may be presumed to be extinct.

* The Jews, in respect to their places of worship, are (by a late Act) subject to the same laws as Protestant dissenters; and, in some few instances, they have accordingly certified their synagogues.

In fact, in the 'Statement of the Total Number of Places of Meeting for Religious Worship certified to the Registrar General under the 15 & 16 Vict. c. 36, up to 1st Jan. 1853,' the religious denominations are reduced to a much smaller catalogue. This return, it will be observed, is of places certified from July to December 1852, inclusive.

Religious Denominations.	1852.						Total Number of Places Certified by each Denomination.
	July.	August.	September.	October.	November.	December.	
Baptists	5	4	11	13	11	8	52
" General	1	3	3	7
" General Baptist New Connexion	1	1	2
" Particular, or Calvinistic... ..	1	5	7	8	2	3	26
Baptists and Independents	1	...	1	2
Bible Christians	2	6	5	4	2	19
Brethren; including Christian Brethren, United Christian Brethren, Christians, and Members of the Church of Christ	3	1	1	2	3	10
Free Church and Free Christian Church	1	1	2
Friends, or Quakers	1	1
Independents, or Congregationalists	3	27	42	32	12	10	126
Independents and Baptists (see Baptists and Independents).							
Latter-Day Saints, or Mormons	4	4	3	8	4	5	28
Methodists:—							
Calvinistic and Welsh Calvinistic	3	4	19	13	57	96
New Connexion	1	1	2	2	...	6
Primitive	4	7	30	61	50	35	187
Wesleyan	6	7	7	16	11	5	52
Wesleyan Methodist Association	1	1	1	...	3
Wesleyan Reformers...	1	6	...	1	2	10
Miscellaneous:—							
All Denominations	1	1	2
Calvinists	1	1
Nonconformists	1	1
Non-Sectarian	1
Protestant Dissenters	1	...	1
Unionists	1	1
Moravians, or United Brethren	1	1
Mormons (see Latter-Day Saints).							
New Church, or New Jerusalem Church	1	...	1	2
One Holy Catholic, or Apostolic Church	1	1
Presbyterians	2	1	3
" United	1	1
Sandemanians	1	1
Unitarians	1	1	...	2
England and Wales	29	69	125	169	118	137	647

It is not to be inferred, that all these newly certified places are new places of worship. They do not, therefore, indicate the progress made by any particular sect. Yet, it is impossible not to notice with astonishment and feelings partaking of indignation, the activity of the Mormonites, as indicated by their having opened twenty-eight places during the last six months of 1852. An objection may be made to the classifying, under the generic name of 'Methodists,' bodies so entirely distinct in origin, and differing so widely, as the Calvinistic Methodists of Wales and the Wesleyan Methodists of the several connexions. The 'miscellaneous' should either be distributed under the heads to which they properly belong (when this can be ascertained), or be reduced to the single class of 'not specified,' since such generic designations as 'Nonconformists,' 'Protestant Dissenters,' 'Calvinists,' 'Non-Sectarian,' cannot be regarded as specifications,* and are, whether intentionally or not, either deceptive or evasive. It will be seen, that of the 649 places, 213 (nearly a third) were certified as belonging to Congregationalists (Independents and Baptists); but the largest number is that of the Primitive Methodists—187. As we have already remarked, how many of these are new places, there are not the means of determining.

We must now advert to the provisions of the Amendment Bill now before the House, the necessity for which has already been explained. The preamble recites the previous Acts, and Clause I. repeals the imperfect Act of last session; providing, however, that the certifying and recording thereunder shall continue to have force and effect. Clause II. enacts, that every place of meeting for religious worship of Protestants, of Roman Catholics, of persons professing the Jewish religion, and of any other body or denomination, shall be certified to the Registrar General through the superintendent registrar of the district in which such place may be situate. Clause III. provides for the record of all such certified places, and abolishes the certifying to or registering in any bishops' or archdeacons' court, or at any general or quarter sessions, agreeably to the Act of last year. Clause IV. requires that all places of meeting for religious worship heretofore certified and registered according to law, and still continuing to be used for such purpose (save those certified to the Registrar General under the said Act of last session), shall be certified to the Registrar General, through the superintendent registrars, on or before January 1854, or shall otherwise cease to be deemed duly

* Arminians might denote either Arminian (or General) Baptists, or, Arminian Methodists, *i. e.*, Wesleyans.

certified and registered, unless and until the same shall have been certified under this Act. Clause V. enacts, that the fee of 2s. 6d. shall be paid with the certificate to the superintendent registrar, in the case of any place of worship certified *for the first time*, (this is obviously intended, though not very clearly expressed;) but, in the case of any place of meeting heretofore certified in manner required by law, and again certified under the last preceding enactment, a fee of 1s. only is to be paid. Clause VI. requires that, in the month of January in every subsequent year, the minister, or one of the deacons, elders, or managers, shall sign a declaration, according to a form to be provided, and left, free of expense, with the minister or officer of the place as above described, by the district registrar, that such place continues to be used as a place of public religious worship, and shall transmit such declaration to the Registrar General. Clause VII. is nearly the same as Clause III. of the repealed Act of 15 and 16 Vict., directing the annual list of certified places to be made out and printed by the Registrar General, and copies of the same to be sent to every superintendent registrar, which shall be open to inspection on payment of a fee of 1s. (The former Act says, 'without fee.') Clause VIII. provides that, upon neglect to transmit the annual declaration required, the Registrar General may cause the record of such place to be cancelled, and, if it has been registered for marriages, to cause such registry to be cancelled. IX. The certifying and recording is not to privilege places not *bonâ fide* used for religious worship. X. Excepts from the Act all churches and chapels of the Established Church. XI. The Registrar General to give certificate of place having been recorded to any person demanding the same, upon payment of 2s. 6d. XII. Such sums to be accounted for, and expenses defrayed, as provided under the General Registration Act. Clause XIII. is a very important one, as declaring all past marriages solemnized in places registered for marriages, but not certified according to law, valid; and Clause XIV. provides, that the existing registration for solemnizing marriages shall be good and valid from the time of certifying under the present Act. XV. The Act not to extend to Scotland or Ireland.

We have deemed it worth while to give this abstract of the Bill, although there can scarcely arise a question as to any of its enactments, unless it be with regard to the clause requiring the signing of an annual declaration, that the certified place of worship continues to be used as such by persons of the same religious denomination as those on whose behalf it has been certified. An annual declaration may be thought by some persons unnecessary; yet, if an annual list of certified places is

to be made out and printed by the Registrar General, it is not easy to show how the correctness of such list can be secured by other means than by such annual declaration. And as this will involve no cost, and no trouble beyond the signature and transmission by the post, it would seem to be the height of unreasonableness to object to the requirement. The only rational ground of objection is founded upon the penalty attaching to refusal, wilful neglect, or, it may be pleaded, inadvertent omission. The record of such place will be cancelled (as it ought to be); but this can scarcely occur in the case of any place of worship of sufficient importance to be registered for the solemnization of marriage. If such an instance were to occur, it might be proper that some inquiry should be made through the superintendent registrar, before the record was cancelled. Moreover, it would be the duty of such registrar to see that no marriages were solemnized in a place of worship that had ceased to be duly registered. In any other case, the place of worship struck off through the neglect of the parties to make the required declaration, might, on their application, be re-certified, without any serious consequence, probably, accruing from their inexcusable omission.

Another plan has been suggested in lieu of requiring this annual declaration; namely, that the district registrars should be charged with the duty of ascertaining and reporting to the Registrar General any places of worship within their district that have ceased to be used for that purpose. We must confess that this does not appear to us an amendment of the provision in the Bill. We should not like to entrust the matter to the discretion or accuracy of a class of individuals not always well disposed to Dissenters. Wilfully false returns from the district registrars might be prevented by imposing the same penalties as in the case of false entries of births or of deaths; but mistakes might easily occur; as, for instance, when a place was temporarily shut up for repairs, for painting, &c. In some mere preaching-stations, it may be found necessary to intermit religious services during the winter, or from causes of temporary operation, for weeks or for months; yet, it would be a hardship, to be liable to have the place reported as having ceased to be used, and to be required to certify it afresh. It might, perhaps, obviate this objection, if no place of worship were to be erased from the general register without satisfactory evidence that it had ceased to be used for such purpose for the twelve months preceding.

It may be a question, however, whether it is at all necessary or desirable, that the Registrar General should be directed and required (as by Clause VII. of the present Bill, and by Clause III. of the 15 and 16 of Vict. c. xxxvi.) to make out and print an

annual list of certified places of worship. A triennial list would, perhaps, sufficiently answer every purpose ; and in that case, a triennial declaration only would be requisite, due notice of which being given, no party could have any excuse for neglecting to furnish it in the mode prescribed.

We shall not attempt any verbal or technical criticism upon the clauses of the Bill, but would suggest one important addition to Clause XI. ; namely, a provision to the effect that every such certificate of a place having been certified and recorded, being duly stamped and sealed, shall be received as evidence in any civil or criminal court, that the place therein described is duly certified ; as certificates of births and deaths, sealed by the Registrar General's seal, are now legal evidence.

We cannot conclude this article without recurring to the remarkable evidence afforded by the returns now for the first time brought into full light, of the irrepressible and expansive force of the religious principle which constitutes the vitality of Protestant Nonconformity. The number of churches and chapels belonging to the Establishment is about 14,000. In the course of the last hundred and sixty years, the Protestant people of this country have, without any aid from the State, erected for their own free worship considerably more than that number of 'separate' buildings, and, though comprising only the less wealthy classes of the community, have provided for the support of the ministers who preach in them, a higher average stipend than falls to the lot of the humble curates who do the drudgery of the Established Church. We will not speak of the power of the voluntary principle to sustain religion, but we adduce this as a proof of the power of religion to sustain the voluntary principle. Let it be recollected, that this is an experiment, if such it may be deemed, or, rather, a great fact, of a century and a half's duration. No sooner was the iron pressure of intolerance removed, on the deposition of James II., than this spirit of religious zeal and earnestness began to manifest itself. 'Immediately on the Revolution,' remarks the Rev. Jos. Hunter, in a valuable memoir, 'the whole nonconforming body was in action. With the energy of people suddenly awakened to a sense of liberty, they set themselves to form congregations, and to erect meeting-houses, in every part of England. Between 1689 and 1693 was the chief period of the work. Meeting-houses arose in every city, with the exception of Ely; in all the large towns; in many populous villages, especially those which lay remote from their parish church; and sometimes in rural places, central to a dispersed population. In a few instances, *there were congregations without meeting-houses; a room in a private house, sometimes the hall of the mansion of some family of distinction, being their place of assembly.* The whole

number of congregations, each with its own minister, founded in the first twenty years after the liberty granted by the Act of Toleration, by Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists, was *between ONE THOUSAND AND ELEVEN HUNDRED*. In these numbers, the Welsh congregations are not included.'

In order correctly to estimate this movement of religious zeal, it must be borne in mind, what was the population of England at the commencement of the last century,—not much above five millions.* The summary of the certified places in the Registrar General's Return gives, as the total number certified between 1688 and 1710, of which any record exists, 3262 houses or rooms, supposed to be temporary, and 226 permanent buildings; together, 3488. The whole of these, with a few exceptions, were in the counties of Cambridge, Chester, Cumberland, Devon, Dorset, Essex, Gloucester, Hertford, Lancaster, Leicester, Middlesex, Salop, Somerset, Southampton, Stafford, Sussex, and York. Of the places certified, prior to 1711, in Bedford, Bucks, Durham, Hereford, Huntingdon, Lincoln, Monmouth, Norfolk, Northampton, Northumberland, Nottingham, Rutland, Wilts, and (with two exceptions) Worcester, there are none included in the summary. There are no entries of certificates granted to Wesleyan and other Arminian Methodists, of course, prior to 1740; and only 230 between 1741 and 1790 (of which 19 only are described as permanent): in the next decennial period, they rise to 358. From 1800, the increase of the total number certified is very remarkable; rising rapidly from 5460 in the first decade of the present century, to 10,161 in the second, and 10,585 in the third. It then declines to 7422, and, between 1841 and 1850, to 5810; although the number of '*permanent* buildings,' in each of the decennial periods since 1811, is between two and three thousand. As there has certainly been no diminution of the rate of increase in chapel extension, this apparent decline must be attributable to neglect in certifying new places of worship, occasioned by the cessation of persecution. It is certain, therefore, that the 35,000 places certified during the present century gives, by no means the actual aggregate. We strongly recommend to our readers to procure this extremely valuable Return (which may be obtained for a shilling), and study its contents for themselves. The original Returns are highly curious, and, having been carefully bound up in volumes, are open to public inspection, at the General Register Office, Somerset House. We again tender our warmest thanks to the Registrar General, and to Mr. Mann also, for the valuable information which has thus been made generally accessible.

* In 1730, it is supposed to have been 5,800,000.

ART. VII.—*The Christian Doctrine of Sin.* Exhibited by Dr. Julius Müller, Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Halle-Wittenberg. Translated from the Original German of the Third Improved and Enlarged Edition. By William Pulsford. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

THE original of this translation, 'Die Christliche Lehre von der Sünde,' appeared in Germany in 1839, with the title—'Vom Wesen und Grunde der Sünde' ('Of the Being and Grounds of Sin'). In 1844, it was enlarged, with the *present* title; and the third edition now translated in part, was published in 1849, with certain modifications suggested by the criticism of other writers, and with additional reasons for maintaining some of the positions to which objections had been made.

It is, in all respects, a work of extraordinary power, though, from its exclusively dealing with German theories but little known here, it can never, perhaps, receive its due appreciation in this country; and as only a portion of it—two books out of five—is given in the present volume, it is impossible for the English reader to obtain more than a partial glimpse of the entire relation borne by the author's reasonings to the special doctrines of Christianity. It requires, moreover, such a constant effort to transfer the reasonings from German to English *methods of thought*, that we can expect them to be mastered by comparatively few of our own theologians. The learned writer himself confesses his ignorance of our language, and doubts whether this work is adapted to become translated into the literature of the British people. With every disposition to receive with candour the translation of so difficult a work, we are constrained to say, that Mr. Pulsford's command of his native language is so far from being perfect that we observe much clumsiness in the style of his preface, a frequent want of exactitude in his renderings, and a general obscurity and inelegance in the structure of his sentences. We wish, too, that either the MS. or the printing had been revised, to avoid such errors as 'bull-work' for 'bulwark;' 'do not,' in p. 6, c. 28, which destroys the sense; 'Origin' for 'Origen;' 'Hyeronymus' for 'Hieronymus;' 'unimpenetrable' for 'impenetrable' (undurchdringlich); 'now-a-day' for 'now-a-days;' 'carritatem' for 'caritatem;' 'Armenian' for 'Arminian;' 'Bellarmenian' for 'Bellarminian;' 'Feridodden' for 'Feridun;' the adverb 'not *seldom*' for the *adjective* 'infrequent;' the preposition 'of' omitted (in p. 219, line 1); 'moments' where the Latin 'momenta,' or some other English

word, such as 'points,' or 'tendencies,' or 'elements,' would have been clearer; 'origineerment' for 'originairement'; 'Ariopagita' for 'Areopagita'; 'usus docendæ' for 'usus docendi,' &c. &c. Notwithstanding these slight blemishes, we gratefully acknowledge the services rendered by Mr. Pulsford in one of the thorniest paths of metaphysical theology. We commend his purpose of publishing 'a brief analysis of the entire work,' exhibiting the logical thread of its connexion, and excluding the extraneous matter. We can quite understand his disclaimer of adherence to all the methods by which the author reaches his results; and we heartily concur with him in the hope that 'its introduction into this country will contribute not a little to stem the fast deepening stream of a religious pantheistico-mystical rationalism, which in divers directions is so widely diffusing itself among us.'

The volume consists of TWO BOOKS. The *first* book relates to—I. The *Reality of Sin*; its nature as a transgression of law; as disobedience against God; and as selfishness, which last characteristic is regarded as its real principle; II. The *Imputation of Sin*; guilt and consciousness of guilt; the guilt of man and his dependence upon God. The SECOND BOOK contains an examination of the *Principal Theories for the Explanation of Sin*: metaphysical imperfection of man; derivation of sin from sensationalism; Schleiermacher's opinion of the origin of sin; derivation of evil from the contrasts of individual life; and the dualistic derivation of evil. Each of these topics is discussed with the utmost possible acuteness and refinement of thought; and numerous questions relating to them are handled in digressions, episodes, and appendices, which will greatly delight the lovers of subtle and elaborated criticism on profoundly recondite thoughts. The author's perfect mastery of the whole field of discussion enables him to dissect the theories that are before him with wonderful success; while the *results* at which he arrives are generally such as are familiar to English divines. The peculiarity of the best German theologians consists less in what they teach than in the *scientific* treatment of truths, which, as they would express it, are taught *empirically** by us. Their philosophy being, in its *principle*, so

* 'Empirical' here means, not as in vulgar use, anything false or delusive, but the method of grounding principles on facts known by experiment,—the *à posteriori* method of reasoning as distinguished from the *à priori*. In this sense of the term, the Baconian philosophy is *empirical*, the Newtonian theory is *mathematical*, or *à priori*: the combination of *both* is the true philosophy—the confirmation of the theory by the facts, and the explanation of the facts by the theory. In theology, the distinction would be expressed by us as the difference between speculative science, and knowledge grounded in scripture and experience.

different from that which generally obtains in this country, their scientific theology is apt to wear, in our eyes, an appearance of mysticalness and unreality; just as our attempts in the same line are regarded by them as shallow, limited, unspiritual, and mechanical. Instead of either aping or despising the 'active subjectivities' of our neighbours, it appears to us that we can learn much from them, and that we may teach them something in return. In the present instance, we must confess, there is more profound thinking on the questions relating to 'Moral Evil' than in any other book we have studied. Theories that pass current with philosophers and theologians are laid bare to their very roots, and their worthlessness is completely exposed. Since *some* of these theories have already been broached, with mischievous effects, among ourselves, we ought not to be satisfied with a merely superficial and popular treatment of them. There *must* be, as there have ever been, and, we hope, ever will be, minds at work in England to detect error in its primary *sources*, as well as in its remoter consequences and grosser forms; and we know not of any department of theological and ethical principles in which these higher services of the most penetrating and disciplined intellect are more *needed*, and more fruitful of ultimate benefit, than in this. It is for such students, for men who seek to ground all their judgments on foundations belonging to the very essence of their minds, that Dr. Müller writes; and—however dry, mystical, or repulsive his disquisitions may seem to minds less exercised in these respects—these hard thinkers will find in them a plentiful stimulus, and the means of arriving at satisfactory conclusions to inquiries which have never ceased to force themselves on their attention in the study of theology; and not on *their* attention only, but, in a vague and perplexing manner, on minds that have neither the ability nor the leisure to examine them so thoroughly as the necessities of the human intellect demand.—For these reasons we now lay before as many of our readers as are likely to attach importance to such abstruse discussions, a general summary of the views which they will find so laboriously and successfully wrought out in this most masterly dissertation. After a searching inquiry into the precise nature, limits, and undue pretensions of the speculative, or *à priori* method of reasoning, the writer applies the results to speculations which are strictly theological, and, of these, to such are concerned with *evil*—showing that—

'This is the unavoidable stone of stumbling on which mere *à priori*ism of thinking must go to pieces; and the investigations of this book hope to make plain that the determination, *à priori*, to arrive at the knowledge of evil, is nothing else than that which must prove destructive to the very notion of evil. For this reason, therefore, it is quite

in order that the advocates of that principle should take lively offence at the more exact and thorough investigation of this subject ; for it throws an obstacle in their way, the existence of which, in order to maintain their position, they are compelled to deny. . . . A philosophy, which, by its theory of knowledge, and the laws of its own method, dependent on the same, *is never able to do justice to personality and freedom*, and the method of *their* operation as principles of reality, must be regarded as utterly inimical to the Christian religion and theology, and utterly preventive of either their quiet associative progress, or of their supplementing each other. And on the other hand, a philosophy which truly satisfies the ideas of divine and human personality is naturally allied to religion, although it may ever develop itself at variance with individual doctrines of the same. It is not merely the world-historical power of Christianity which conditions the possibility of such a philosophy ; the very goad against which the systems radically inimical to Christianity kick, drives them forward ; but the philosophy which satisfies the idea of divine and human personality finds in Christianity its positive confirmation, as well the completion of its beginnings of knowledge. . . . The systems of philosophy have fallen by their contradiction of Christianity ; they have not been able to take firm hold in the spiritual life of modern times, because they could not truly attach themselves to the deepest and most powerful root of the same. If philosophy only once succeed in finding for this attachment the immovable point of support, it will then also have tasks which will not permit it to rest, both for the completion of its system, and for the ever deepening penetration into the individual spheres of knowledge ; but it will no longer, like *Penelope*, be under the necessity of ever anew beginning its web.—But such a philosophy does not furnish *the basis* of Christian faith, which indeed possesses in itself the absolutely sufficient ground of its certitude, and must have entirely renounced itself before it could receive its ground of certitude from philosophy.’—pp. 19—21.

‘When only such a philosophy of Christian theism shall be found, which shall know just as well how purely to express the idea of *personality*, as to preserve the *certain results* of the scientific culture of the age—which, without depreciating honourable attempts in this direction, we must still regard as a postulate—then, of course, dogmatic theology will be able to free itself of many elements, which it is now obliged to take up into its sphere ; but without therefore losing its position as a separate science in distinction from philosophy. In that case dogmatic theology would only have the task of teaching the facts of the saving revelation of God, and its result arising from its nature in humanity, without being obliged to enter upon the development of the general *momenta* (truths) of religious knowledge, which constitute its presupposition.’—p. 22.

We have given these extracts for the purpose of introducing our readers to the author’s course of thought, as well as for the sake of exhibiting the views taken by a *German* divine of the relation of philosophy to the Christian faith.

Dr. Müller speaks of sin as ‘a nightly shadow which darkens every circle of human life, and which we ever anew behold swallowing up its fairest and brightest forms.’ He appeals to all men for the *reality* of this dreadful evil, which is not a necessity of nature, but a self-willed opposition to an imperative and recognised moral law; not a disease, but a blameworthy fault; not merely a violation of order, but a disobedience to a Being, of whose will the law is the expression,—‘the *estrangement of man from God*,’ in the want of love to Him; not, however, a bare negation, but a *positive*. ‘The evil, therefore, which man, in his sin, puts in the place of God, can be no other than *his own self*. This individual self, and its gratification, he makes the highest end of his life. His striving in all the different forms and directions of sin, ever has self ultimately in view; the inmost nature of sin, the principle determining, and pervading it, in all its forms, is *selfishness*,’ p. 136. The illustration of the truth thus simply expressed spreads over many pages, rich in critical examinations of opposing theories and minor discussions of closely related questions, that could neither be condensed nor selected without doing injustice to the fulness and power of the style, which combines the closest possible vigour of argument with the amplitude and ripeness of an almost poetic fancy, guided throughout by a healthy spirit of Christian morality, indignantly rebuking the sinner, while it triumphantly destroys the sophisms by which he would extenuate his sin.

In discoursing on *guilt, and the consciousness of guilt*, Dr. Müller demolishes the dangerous fallacy which would confound the moral with the æsthetic, the good with the beautiful, the commission of sin with the violation of good taste. Sin is not only *in* us, but *from* us. It is condemned as being our own. We condemn *ourselves* when our consciousness of it is awakened. We then feel an abiding unworthiness. We *recognise* our obligation to render satisfaction to the inviolable majesty of the law, and of the lawgiver.

‘It must be admitted that *guilt* is of far greater magnitude, and more widely diffused than its *consciousness* in man; guilt is not always a conscious condition of the subject, even when he is under both its arrest and responsibility: it sleeps in innumerable cases; and only there can be wakened—not merely as a reprover of individual crimes, but as a testimony of an opposition pervading the entire nature of its subject against the holy arrangements of life, where the spirit is no longer fettered by the trammels of moral obtuseness and indifference. But even where there is wanting in the sinner a real consciousness of guilt, there is, nevertheless, not wanting to him a feeling which we must regard as a germ of the same. He may be free from appalling wickedness, but so long as he continues to live in the service of his

passions and selfish interests, he is not truly at one with himself; a dark presentiment tells him that the sphere in which he lives is not his true home; there occur to him moments in which a feeling of insecurity warns him of the fatal ground on which he stands. The service of sin can never give freedom to the breast, but only confine it in narrower limits.

‘But when the real consciousness of guilt breaks forth from this dark germinal concealment, then we possess actual proof that sin does not yet pervade the entire moral existence; the self-condemnation in the evil conscience is the efflux of the acquiescence which man is obliged involuntarily, nay, often in opposition to his will, in his inmost consciousness, to give to the contents of the law. Even when man has resigned himself up to the service of sin, it does not lose for him, so long as it remains short of the climax of its perverted development, the character of a foreign power, which, although resident in him only by his own self-determination, nevertheless divides him from himself, and sets him at variance with himself. The consciousness of guilt has this remarkable two-sidedness: on the one hand, *it ascribes sin to the Ego of man*, makes the person responsible for it; on the other hand, immediately on its existence, it reveals a *concealed tendency of personality, which attaches to the law of God*, and directs itself condemningly against the endeavours and conduct of the selfish Ego. The true essence of the Ego, which is only able to realize itself in fellowship with God, and distinguishes itself from sin as from a foreign element, is at variance with the empirical condition of the Ego, according to which it must look upon sin as its own. . . . The trouble and anguish which the remonstrances of this consciousness excites, the inward unrest which sometimes seizes the slave of sin, are proofs that he has not got quite broken away from God. If sin be a struggle of the creature to tear itself from God, this struggle is not only for ever outwardly fruitless, but inwardly it has failed of its end, so long as the consciousness of guilt is not utterly extinguished.’—pp. 224, 226.

The theoretical treatment of this guiltiness of man, both by modern philosophers and by the epic and tragic poets of Greece, is proved to be inconsistent with the elementary constitution of the mind, and contradictory to all just conceptions of the ‘creative efficiency of God.’ In like manner the author disposes of the scholastic doctrine retained by the older reformers of the ‘*concursum dei generalis*,’ with a special consideration of its incongruity with the doctrine of the *judgment* of God, and that of *redemption*. The wide bearing of the following observations on some fashionable opinions in the domains both of theology and of *jurisprudence*, need scarcely to be pointed out:—

‘If the common opinion were correct, that the design of punishment altogether lay in the *improvement* of the offender, it would, indeed, make clear the direct connexion of the notion of punishment with that of *sin*, but not with that of *guilt*. The consideration keeps

entirely to this, that by the aid of punishment something which ought not to be—sin—is to be removed from man; the moment (element) that man is the *responsible author* of this, which is to be removed—the basis of the notion of guilt—does not all appear. But this opinion of the design of punishment just rests upon the *confounding of the notion of punishment with that of chastisement*. Chastisement has entirely the improvement of the pupil for its object; punishment the actual manifestation that the majesty of the law has not been really injured by rebellion against it. . . . Chastisement, as such, has its end entirely in the individual subject; punishment, *as such*—for it is a matter self-evident that it may unite with itself the element of chastisement—has to maintain the universal against the individual. . . . As to the *Divine punishment*, its real design can so much the less be the improvement of the punished, since this, indeed, is just the end of *redemption*, regarded in the full truth of its notion. If now punishment were means adapted to this end, redemption would not be requisite, or rather inversely,—if this end is to be attained by redemption, what purpose is answered by severe means of punishment? Or are we thus, perhaps, to conceive of the relation, that when redemption is not able to effect the improvement of man, he must be brought to this end by punishment? But then it would follow that punishment is a more powerful means of regeneration than redemption.’—p. 262.

The review of the *church development of doctrine* shows how Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Bradwardine, Luther, and the other reformers, regarded this matter; and though severe criticism detects in their views not a little metaphysical perplexity, it is made sufficiently plain that while the most energetic Christianity was found compatible with the speculations of earlier theologians, some of those very speculations, when traced to their principle, and pressed to their logical consequences, by the modern German philosophy, ‘cannot scientifically develop themselves without leading to pantheism.’

We have no desire at present to follow Dr. Müller through his triumphant discussion of theories, professing to solve the mystery of the *origin* of evil. The more we read and think on that subject, the more we are convinced that we are not endowed with faculties for reaching its determination. The author himself would seem to be of the same mind, for he says,—‘We will not here decide whether perhaps it is not contained in the very notion of sin, that a solution is not to be expected which absolutely abolishes the enigma as such.’ We nevertheless agree with him when he adds,—‘But if the consideration be only able to lead us to see *that*, and *why*, such a solution is impossible which converts the dark abyss in which sin is brought forth into light and clearness, this result must indeed be in the highest degree profitable for the better under-

standing of man, his eternal destiny, and the relations of his present condition to the same.' What he requires in theories for solving this 'enigma' is, that they shall not contradict the results of his inquiries into the nature and form of sin; and that they shall harmonize both with the social consciousness of man, and with the revelations of the divine word.

The *first* theory brought to this reasonable test is that which Leibnitz so cautiously developed in his 'Theodicée,' and which was adopted by the late Dr. Edward Williams, of Rotherham, in his 'Equity and Sovereignty,' and other works. The germ of this theory lies in the notion of *imperfection*, as necessarily involved in that of a created being—the famous *causa deficiens*. This metaphysical imperfection may be regarded either as *necessitating* sin, in which case the *idea* of sin is contradicted; or merely as supplying the ground for the *possibility* of sin, in which case, the actual cause of the *possible* becoming *real* must be found in God, which contradicts the moral consciousness in man, and is not a *solution*, but a *metaphysical statement* of the problem, that problem, however, being not metaphysical, but *ethical*. The conception of evil as simple *privation*, in this theory, is but a partial view of the matter, happily exposed by saying, 'to resolve to dismiss a problem on which for thousands of years the deepest minds have laboured summarily—with *Spinoza* explaining it as a nonentity—as not existing—certainly appears more like a *desertion* than a solution of the same.'—p. 312. Neither consciousness nor scripture can be satisfied with such philosophy, and therefore it can find no place in a true theology.

The *second* theory—treating sin as having in it not only that which is negative, but also that which is positive—traces its origin in the *dominant power of sensational nature over the spirit*. That our susceptibility of sensations from the outward world is not *itself* evil will be at once acknowledged; on the other hand, it will not be denied that—in some forms of sin—the predominance of the sensational over the rational and moral capacities of our being is manifest; but the moral consciousness takes to *itself* the blame of this disorder, and the real question is, how came the higher faculty which we term *will* to determine, contrary to its own law, to *choose* this disorder, to abandon its own freedom and authority. Besides, there are forms of sin quite independent of an inordinate sensation, to which the theory can have no application; so that it must be rejected as altogether insufficient to explain the difficulty with which it professes to grapple: indeed, it never touches it, for it relates to a supposed case of suffering—not to the actual case of sinning. The theory resolves itself eventually into fatalism, and

thus is directly opposed to the real *nature* of sin, as previously ascertained. The *apparent* sanction derived for this theory, from certain passages relating to '*the flesh*' in the New Testament, is entirely removed by critical and extensive consideration of the passages themselves. The refined speculations both of Kant and of Schleiermacher, tending to a conclusion similar to that of the theory now considered, are dealt with in their own way, and amply refuted.

The *third* theory for explaining the origin of sin is described as '*the derivation of sin from the contrasts of individual life*,'—a description which it is not easy to make intelligible to the English reader by so brief an explanation as the longest for which we have space in this paper: even Dr. Müller's development of it in his '*representative sketch*,' which is very skilful and condensed, would fill about six of such pages as these. The relations of light to darkness, and the opposition of forces in the growth of plants, are represented as analogous to the relation between good and evil, being the relation of natural antitheses, or polarities. The germs of such a theory, closely allied to Gnosticism and Manichæism, are found in the writings of Lactantius, Scotus, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Leibnitz, Schleiermacher, and of all the holders of that *optimism* which '*makes not merely the possibility, but also the reality of evil the indispensable condition of the greatest possible perfection of the world.*' It is pushed to its extreme point by Blasche, who in 1827 published a work entitled '*Das Böse im Einklange mit der Weltordnung.*'—('Evil in Unison with the Plan of the World')—a work which presents under new modifications the fundamental thought in the philosophies both of Schelling and of Hegel. The objections to the theory are urged with a keenness of criticism, and a vigour of reasoning with which it is impossible for the cultivated intellect not to be delighted; the true is separated from the false with a clearness of perception and a strength of discrimination belonging only to the highest order of human intelligence in its most athletic efforts. He demonstrates that evil is *not* a contrast, such as science recognises in the reciprocal attractions and repulsions of nature, but *the real opposition against the good*, and that the attempt to carry such analogies into the relations of evil to good betrays an utter blindness to the characteristic of all moral relations as distinguished from those which are physical. . . . 'The variance of man with God is not to be *theoretically discovered*, but can *only be experienced*, therefore is not a momentum of a necessary process, but absolutely an act of arbitrariness.'—p. 440.

We cannot conceal our regret at being compelled to compress the noble chapter in which Dr. Müller exhibits the fourth theory

of the origin of evil—the *dualistic*—the shortest, and, in many respects, the most interesting chapter in the volume. The theory supposes an eternal absolute evil co-existent with the ‘eternal absolute good,’ or, as it may be expressed, though not with perfect accuracy, an evil God co-existent with the Good. The author demonstrates the impossibility of this, from the very nature of good and of evil, the former being independent of evil, but the latter *necessarily pre-supposing* the former. Such an impossible theory likewise contradicts our moral consciousness. Evil is that which *ought not* to be: to speak of it as, in any sense, absolutely original is, therefore, self-contradictory, that is to say, strictly *absurd*. We conclude with a fine passage which displays the hollowness of all the pantheistic notions underlying not only this, but all the foregoing explanations of the origin of evil, while it refreshes us by its majestic assertion of true Christian doctrine:—

‘The good, the positive negation and denial of which constitutes the evil—*evil*, is not at all the mere reality, but the inmost being of *ethical good—love*. If, in the depths of our moral consciousness, evil reveals itself not merely as an irrationality, emptiness, nothingness, but as something fearful and horrible, as a streaming source of thousand-fold woes, this will not be truly intelligible to us so long as the Eternal primitive Being from whom man, in evil, turns himself away, is conceived of only as *absolute substance*, as *the most real of all being*, and the like. But the very pith of the Christian doctrine of God is just—that the very God who is the *absolute Being*, and contains in Himself the ground of all other reality, is at the same time *personality and love*. It is only now, since we recognise that man, in evil, opposes the holiest love by a will of separation and of enmity, that the peculiar character of our moral consciousness in relation to evil—the deep abhorrence which can only there disappear where this consciousness is learned—discovers itself; it is only now that the feelings of shame, of repentance, of anxiety, of conscience, find their true significance. Were not GOD LOVE, there might, indeed, be badness, nothingness—but *not evil*.’—p. 447.

We shall be glad to resume our notice of this truly magnificent work as soon as the translator presents it to us entire in an English dress. As Mr. Pulsford has given no intimation of the contents of the second volume, we may as well inform the reader that three books remain to be translated, viz.,—the *third*, which discusses at great length what the author styles the possibility of sin, involving its consideration with reference to the freedom of moral agency; the *fourth* book, on ‘The Diffusion of Sin;’ the *fifth*, and last, on ‘The Development of Sin in the Individual.’

- ART. VIII.—*Address of the Society of the Friends of Italy.* Published at the Offices of the Society, 10, Southampton-street, Strand. 1851.
2. *Monthly Record of the Society of the Friends of Italy for March,* 1853.

IT was premature to call the recent insurrection at Milan decisively a failure. A failure in one respect it certainly was. It failed in producing the effect immediately intended—a universal rising of the Italians against their oppressors. As the intended signal and beginning of a struggle which was to go on continuously until there should be a fair decision of the question whether the Italians at the present moment are a match for the Austrians at the present moment, the insurrection in the capital of Lombardy *was* a failure. But that insurrection—that hint at an insurrection, as it may be rather called—has had other effects. It remains yet to be seen whether it may not after all, if not obviously and literally, at least by a necessary moral connexion, prove the beginning of precisely such a movement in Italy as it was meant to inaugurate. It remains to be seen whether the present year will pass by without some more general movement in Italy—to which more general movement the affair of February last in Milan will then appear to have been an indispensable antecedent. The sudden escape of volcanic lava at one point of the covering crust may seem as suddenly to have ceased, and yet this very taste of the upper air may help to agitate the subterranean mass for a speedy and more extended explosion. This, we say, remains to be seen. But as to one important effect of the attempted insurrection at Milan there can even now be no doubt. That attempted insurrection has reopened the European question. It has replaced the case of Italy, and all that is connected with it, on the desks of our statesmen. It has taught tyrants that they shall have no rest. It has spread abroad, at a time when it was beginning to be thought by even the most reluctant that all was stable for the present in the state of Europe, the conviction that all is unstable. It has once more impressed upon the world, what they were beginning to doubt, that there can be no order where there is no progress, and that the boasted order which is effected by bayonets and garrisons is a thing which history laughs at and a moment may tear into shreds. It has thus arrested amongst us a manifest tendency to political Sadderism, to despair in those doctrines as to the social future of nations which were conceived a while ago to be established

truths. And this it has done, above all, by reminding us of the existence of at least one man among us who does believe in the resurrection. Once more the name of Mazzini is on the lips of all Europe; once more his olive countenance is present in the imagination of all his contemporaries. Unrecognised by our professional and aristocratic statesmen, standing out of the pale of courts and cabinets, performing his work, and conducting his correspondence, not in official saloons, but here and there as chance may lead him, the hero of the Roman republic has shown that in his hands also there still lies a power to affect and startle Europe. We talk of tendencies—there always is a tendency where there is a man with an indestructible purpose. So long as Mazzini still walks the earth, so long as the tenacious soul is not killed out of his perishable body, there is a tendency in Europe to another state of things than exists at present. The tyrants know this, and would buy his life with gold; the peoples know this, and pray for his preservation. What his own thoughts at this moment may be we know not. For a while despondency may have come upon him, and he may have sat in his Swiss retreat melancholy and disheartened amid the ashes of his recent scheme; but even then it must have been his proud satisfaction to know that, if his scheme had had no other result, it had at least been true to the purpose of his whole life, which has been one continued protest against the spirit of political Seducement. Already, however, we believe, the despondency must be gone; and out of the very ashes on which he gazed, new hopes and new visions must be rising to his view.

The Milan insurrection, we believe, has not yet been fairly appreciated in this country. We propose, therefore, to give as exact an interpretation of the affair as the information we have acquired enables us to put together; and to this we shall append such general considerations connected with the affair and its consequences, as it seems desirable that liberal men among ourselves should be beginning to entertain.

That a revolution is desirable in Italy, a revolution of some kind or other that would have the effect of emancipating the Italians from the thralldom which now oppresses them—this, it may be assumed, is a belief common to all with whom it is necessary to hold any argument on this or any other subject. It requires but the most superficial acquaintance with the present condition of Italy, to enable any man of ordinary intelligence or of ordinary heart to say most conscientiously that he believes this. Take, for example, the following succinct description of the state of Italy addressed to the English public by a society which has charged itself with the duty of keeping the Italian question alive in the minds of our countrymen:—

‘What is Italy? Italy is a country half as large again as Great Britain, naturally one of the richest and most beautiful, and historically the most glorious, on the face of the earth; inhabited at present by upwards of twenty-four millions of human beings, as finely organized as any that the world can show, one in race, one in language, one in all the great features of national character, one in the memories, and above all in the sufferings of the past, one in aspiration towards the future. There are not greater ethnographical differences between the Italians of localities the most distant from each other than there are between the Englishmen of different English counties, or between the Frenchmen of different French departments; and what petty local jealousies did exist between Italian cities and neighbourhoods have either disappeared or are fast disappearing under the influence of a common national patriotism. These twenty-four millions of Italians are divided into seven states under separate masters. In one of these—the Lombardo-Venetian territory, counting a population of between five and six millions—a band of Germans, strangers to the soil and its people, hold the rule, maintaining it by means of barbarian soldiers, collected from Central and Eastern Europe, and scattered in garrisons through the towns and cities. . . . In the other states, the native rulers, generally of foreign descent, are, either willingly or perforce, the slaves of the same Austrian power, governing in its interest and according to its maxims. In Piedmont alone, in consequence of the recent revolutions, is there any real degree of independence or any approach to political freedom; and even now there hangs over that country the threat of Austrian invasion, unless it shall retrograde and be as it was. In the kingdom of Naples, counting nearly six millions of inhabitants, a sovereign, appointed, as the theory is, to be the shepherd of these millions, prowls among them like a human wolf. In the Papal States, with two millions and a half of inhabitants, the special misery of ecclesiastic rule, lacerating the very heart and demoralizing the very conscience of the people, is superadded to the horror of secular despotism. In Tuscany and the smaller states, it is no better. Nowhere in all Italy, save now partly among the Piedmontese, can a man think, speak, or act, as a being made in the image of God. From one end of that noble peninsula to the other, a continuous network of foreign domination, native official tyranny in the service of the foreigner, and priestly bigotry co-operating for ends of its own, is nailed down over a prostrate and struggling people.—Let Englishmen but make the case their own. Let them imagine a fourth part of the soil of England in possession of the Czar of Russia—governed in his name by Russian functionaries, and garrisoned by soldiers in Russian uniform. Let them suppose the wealth of this portion of England drained away to fill the treasury of St. Petersburg, its young men levied to serve in the armies of the Czar in other lands, its courts of justice subjected to Russian control, its schools and colleges regulated by Russian superintendents, its literary men under Russian censorship, all the journals suppressed with the exception of an official Russian Gazette or two, its very catechisms and grammars tinctured to the Russian taste, public

meetings of every kind prohibited, the streets patrolled by Russian sentinels, and every English man, woman, child, and thing at the mercy of Russian insolence. Let them farther fancy that the rest of this wretched island of Great Britain were divided into six or seven other states, governed absolutely by dukes or princes, the liveried servants of the Czar, and in constant communication with the court of St. Petersburg. . . . And fancying all this, let Englishmen fancy what they would in these circumstances do. Conspire—in the name of freedom, and of all that is holy, conspire ; organise, and combine, and scheme, and plot, and dig underground through the whole of England, if they could, one vast connected mine of free association ; watch the ripe hour of action ; and then, rising in a mass, put a torch to the ready train, and, if possible, blow Russian and Despot and all their accursed trappings and machinery out of the land together ! That is what every Englishman with a soul in his body will say that Englishmen would do. That is what many even of those thoughtless Englishmen who now malign poor Italy for acting in the same manner, would be among the first to advise.’—‘Address of the Society of the Friends of Italy.’

Men, we repeat, who do not respond to these considerations are men whom it is useless to argue with on any practical subject. We can conceive but one mode of thinking, entitled to be called respectable, that could have the slightest hesitation in accepting such views in the strongest form in which they could be expressed,—that mode of thinking, namely, which sees nothing as either wrong or right in history, but everything as equally necessary. ‘If the Austrians are masters of Italy,’ say some, ‘this fact has been brought about by some necessary train of circumstances in the past, and it has some necessary meaning as regards the future. Nations are factitious things ; there is not a nation in the world but has at some period or other had a foreign ingredient dominant in it ; and if the Austrians can keep Italy, it is, doubtless, because Italy has need of some factitious element to evolve her capabilities as a nation, which factitious element the Austrian rule supplies.’ There are, we know, a few speculative men, who reason in this manner. These men, however, stand beyond the pale of our present argument. On the one hand, if they maintain their views to their utmost speculative extent, they are as much with us as against us. If they regard the Austrian occupation of Italy as necessary and legitimate, so long as it is a fact, then whatever is hostile to that occupation, every attempt of the Italians to drive the Austrians out, they must regard as necessary and legitimate too. On the other hand, so far as their want of sympathy with the aspiration of the Italians after national independence rests on any lurking belief that the so-called factitious element of Austrian rule in Italy is producing good, they must

meet us in the field of facts, and debate with us the question whether, on any possible supposition, a government which acts as Austria has been acting in Italy, can be said to be supplying the kind of factitious element which any mind but that of a demon could desire to see supplied to any nation on the earth. The result of such a controversy would be decisive enough.

But if all liberal men are agreed that a revolution of some kind or other in Italy is desirable, there certainly are differences of opinion as to the kind of revolution that is desirable, and as to the best mode of beginning it, and carrying it through. A large class of persons, and particularly in England, are full of the notion of the absolute perfection of what is called Constitutionalism; that is, so far as it can be defined, of a system of political arrangements resembling that which exists in England. Applying their notion to Italy, they conceive that the best revolution for Italy would be a revolution in which each separate section of the Italians—the Neapolitans, the Romans, the Tuscans, the Lombards, &c.—should wring from their existing princes a constitutional charter, to which they should be obliged respectively to conform. Within Italy itself there is, or rather was, a party holding substantially these views. They call themselves the *Moderate Party*. The events of 1848—49, however, smashed their original theory in pieces; and to maintain again that a revolution is to be effected by the Neapolitans going to king Bomba, and the Romans to the Pope, and the Lombards to Francis-Joseph, and each fetching back a constitution wrung from the royal gentleman, would be regarded by all ranks and classes in Italy as sheer idiocy. Accordingly, the present form of moderatism in Italian politics has for its main idea the propagation of Piedmontese influence throughout the peninsula, so as either to disintegrate the other Italian governments, and attach their populations one by one to the Piedmontese crown, or so to overawe them as to make the game of constitution-wresting from their present princes easier to these populations. The tenets of this sect are very vague; but it has a large number of adherents in Piedmont. Secure of tolerable liberty themselves, they believe that somehow it may be extended, but are content rather selfishly to leave the problem of *how* it is to be extended to the chapter of accidents. Distinct, however, from this party, and counting among its adherents a large proportion of the Piedmontese, especially of the Piedmontese people, and nearly all the ardent patriots in the other states of Italy, is the party called the *National Party*. Their notion of the only desirable, both because it is the best and because it is the only possible, revolution, is that it be a revolution of the whole Italian

nation, disregarding its present political subdivision into states, and endeavouring to reconstruct itself so as to add to the map of Europe a united and compact nation, called the nation of Italy, as homogeneous and as powerful as France, Spain, Russia, or England. With them the notion of Italian independence is inseparable from the notion of Italian unity. Not only do they affirm that the notion of Italian unity is a practicable one, which has been entertained by all sagacious men who have made Italy a subject of thought, from Dante to Napoleon; they also affirm that, even were there greater difficulties in the way, the notion cannot be given up without sacrificing also the notion of Italian freedom. Italy, they say, never can, in the possibility of things, be free, except as a united nation. As to the form of government under whose auspices such a union could take place, they are, in theory, at least, less dogmatic. If a king can do it, they will welcome a king; if it can be only done by a republic, then they will have a republic! On the whole, however, as men bound to count not on what is exceptional but only on what is normal and general, they are in favour of a republic. The national party of Italy are, to a man, republicans; and it is of this party that Mazzini is the head.

But, farther. As there are differences among the Italians, and among those who sympathize with them, as to the kind of revolution that is desirable, so there have been, and are, differences among them as to the proper time and mode of initiating a revolutionary movement. All, of course, are agreed that a movement should be attempted only in circumstances which should give it a chance of success. But different parties have defined these circumstances differently. Some have all along been slaves to the notion that the necessary prerequisite to a successful rising in Italy is a convulsed state of the rest of Europe. Italy is to bide her time, and that time is when the other nations are already astir! And as they thus place the initiative out of Italy in the field of general Europe, so, in accordance with a belief hereditary in the minds of nations since 1789, they have placed it specially in France. When France stirs, then is the time; till France stirs, a revolution in Italy or anywhere else, is premature and hopeless! Such is, and was, the notion of thousands of the Italian patriots, including not only those of the moderate party, but even many of the national party, and especially such as are connected more immediately with the middle classes of society. Many, even, who hate France, and denounce her as the fountain of materialism and ignoble views in politics and philosophy, cling almost unconsciously to this theory of the French initiative. Now, there is this in Mazzini,

over and above his being the acknowledged leader of the national party in Italy, that he has always been at war with the notion that Italy, or any other oppressed nation, is at the mercy of a Parisian tumult. Believing more than most men that all the peoples of Europe have a common cause, and will, in the end, form a true confederacy, he has, from first to last, made it a collateral aim of his life to argue down the notion of the French initiative in European affairs, and, above all, to dispossess his countrymen of it, as a crotchet ruinous to their moral character, whether free or not free, as well as to their hopes of ever being free. God has placed the motives to act in the heart of the man or nation who is required to act, and not exclusively in the Faubourg St. Antoine; the initiative in European affairs lies with whoever will take it—such has ever been the maxim of Mazzini, such one of the most powerful intellectual ingredients of his singular genius. We believe, even, that in his own Italian heart he carries his protest against the doctrine of a French initiative farther, and that his notions of the peculiar capabilities and constitution of his own nation, and of the peculiar situation of the European problem in this age of political and religious anarchy, dispose him to regard it as certain that for the present, at least, the European initiative, if it lies anywhere at all, lies in Italy itself. Be this as it may, it has ever been his unwavering conviction that, for her own emancipation, Italy must trust to her own will and her own resources. Not that a convulsed state of the rest of Europe, and of France in particular, may not favour the chances of an Italian insurrection, but that the habit of counting on this is in itself a kind of moral prostration, disqualifying for action on behalf of liberty, and for the enjoyment of liberty when attained.

That Italy must win her freedom, not by a side-wind from France, but by a general, unanimous insurrection of her own people, contemporaneous it might be with a political crisis in France, but not dependent on such a crisis—this, then, has been the faith and doctrine of Mazzini since he and Young Italy were first heard of. But, if a nation is thus to act, it must have an organization. Let it be granted that Italy must depend on her own resources, rise in her own strength, choose her own moment, then it is a necessary part of any such scheme that Italy shall possess within herself not only an insurrectionary enthusiasm, but also an insurrectionary mechanism. Has Italy such a mechanism, such an organization for preparing, devising, and directing an insurrectionary movement? She has. For twenty years there has been forming, and extending itself throughout Italy, under the auspices of Mazzini and the national party, a

secret organization unparalleled in modern history, and such as no people, not trained as the Italians have been to underground activity by systematic repression of all open dealing after the English fashion, could have constructed and kept together. This organization, which is a very different thing from the old association of the Carbonari, and which embraces an incalculable number of patriots of all ranks and classes, pervades all Italy from one end to the other. It is above a year and a half since the correspondent of one of our English newspapers, dating from Rome, described in the following terms this formidable *invisible government in Italy*, and his impressions of it:—

‘On arriving at Rome—I mean on arriving at hotels wholly tenanted, when tenanted at all, by Americans and Englishmen—and on the very day of your arrival, you hear of the *invisible government*. What is the “invisible government?” A mere creation of the fancy of your *valet de place*? No; the mysterious impression which he endeavoured to convey is confirmed by the banker, the librarian, and the *calessero* who drives you through the Corso. The “invisible government” is spoken of everywhere with more reverence than is shown in England for the House of Commons, and far more respect than the French National Assembly popularly elicits. You cannot be three days in Rome without feeling that its government is unequally divided between three powers—the French commanders, who are abhorred; the pope’s administration, which is despised; and the “invisible government,” all-pervading, all-permeating, the most potent of the three, because its power is founded on the unanimous sympathy and voluntary obedience of the people. I would fain believe that anything which constitutes a check on the shameless persecution and rapine in which the papal authorities indulge, is beneficial; and I cannot but admit that this extraordinary secret combination is directed by men whose moderation is creditable and systematic; but it is fearful to think that an irresponsible agency should thus be subterraneously at work, upheaving the very ground under one’s feet. . . . The “invisible government,” I found, to my surprise, to be an extensive and complete organization, pervading Italy, but more peculiarly developed in Lombardy and Romagna; having for its object Italian unity and independence, and possessing its funds, revenues, arms, soldiers, agents, and police. Mysterious but unfailing in its operation as the *Wehmgericht* of the middle age, it differs from the *Wehmgericht*, from Carbonarism, and all other previous associations that I know of in this respect, that *a whole nation seems to be conspiring*. I verily believe that three out of four individuals in Rome and in the chief parts of Romagna are enlisted in this society; and daily proofs are afforded that the conspiracy pervades every department of the state—the police, the army, the post-office, and the very antechambers of the Vatican. It has its regular press, distributing thousands of its fly-sheets with all the regularity which attends the delivery of a London newspaper; yet, so extensive are the ramifications of complicity that neither press,

printer, writers, nor distributors have ever yet been seized. . . . This mysterious agency seems to have secured a subordination as wide as its extension. I am credibly informed that its levies in Romagna are regimented and officered, and I know that its revenues in the form of a national loan are regularly levied to meet its current expenses and provide a store of arms and ammunition for the day of insurrection.'—Occasional correspondent of the 'Daily News,' Aug. 4, 1851.

Allowing as much as we choose for exaggeration in this account, the main fact which it presents to the English public is indubitably true—that there is an 'invisible government' in Italy, a secret patriotic organization, pervading the whole peninsula, but having its chief knots in the cities of Lombardy and Romagna. One of the most signal proofs of the power of this organization was given on the occasion of the anniversary of the Roman Republic in February, 1852. It was publicly announced by placards on the walls of Rome, by the secret Roman committee, that a hundred petard shots would be fired at certain places in the city at a certain hour of the day—February the 9th—in honour of the republic. Despite this daring publicity, and despite all the precautions of the police, the shots were punctually fired at the places and at the hour fixed, and the police had to content themselves with some thirty or forty arrests afterwards on suspicion. And as in Rome, so in other towns of the papal states, and in the Lombard cities, there are committees exercising the administrative functions of the organization, the various committees being linked together in each province under a central management. Recently, in token of the common aspiration after Italian unity, there has been a movement among the committees towards a hierarchical arrangement, subordinating the committees of all the separate states to one supreme direction, located at Rome. This concentration of the executive of the National Italian Association in the Roman Central Committee was formally gazetted in the Italian clandestine press.

Italy, then, if she has resolved to trust to no initiative but her own, is not blindly trusting to the extemporaneous creation of such an initiative in the hour of action, but is provided with an organization, a kind of national brain, already qualified to take the initiative. So powerful, indeed, is this organization, so large a proportion of the Italian population does it include as actual enrolled members, and so many more are represented by it in sentiment without actually belonging to it, that the wonder to a plain-thinking Englishman might be how it is that, with such an organization, Italy does not contrive, at one throe, to heave off her tyrants, with their armies, garrisons, and police. It is only by remembering what a terrible force of repression may be

exerted over the most unanimous and extensive population by armies in military possession of the soil, and by remembering that in Italy the arms of France and of Austria co-operate with the troops of the native tyrants in keeping the people down, that one can surmount this feeling of wonder. Even as it is, however, it is necessary to suppose considerable exaggeration in the account of the invisible government in Italy just quoted.

Since the suppression of the Roman republic in 1849, Mazzini, a resident in England, had been looking forward to the hour when, assisted by some conjuncture in European politics without, or even if not assisted by any such conjuncture, Italy, thinking for herself at large, or thinking through her revolutionary committees, should feel herself ripe for a simultaneous revolt. There is no use of mincing that fact—to know anything of Mazzini is to know that this must have been the case; for what else is Mazzini but the soul of Italy incarnate? Yes, and to any true Englishman it ought to be a proud thing to know that as the Italian patriot walked in our streets and breathed our air, he *could* indulge in this thought, he *could* keep his eyes fixed on Italy, and watch for the expected signal, with the certainty that, though all men knew what he was thinking and saw whither his eyes were bent, none would dare to say: 'We will not have that man stay here!' But, while he stayed among us, and while, full of his ancient faith that the Italians, even unaided and alone, would, in given circumstances, suffice for their own initiative, he had his gaze fixed in the direction of the Alps, there happened that which contributed a new element to his calculations, and poured upon the imaginary battle-field which his fancy painted, masses of men not supplied by Italy herself and yet fighting on her side. Before Kossuth left Kutayah, communications were opened between him and Mazzini; and, as far as the promises of the two leaders could pledge the two nations, Hungary and Italy were pledged to act in concert in any future struggle for the freedom of either. And, after Kossuth's arrival in this country, this pledge was formally renewed in personal conferences between the two leaders, and again and again openly avowed in the presence of the British public. Here, then, was an element in the Italian question distinct from all that had existed before 1849—an element large enough to reconcile even the most shrewd and timid among the sympathizers with Italian freedom, to Mazzini's bold abandonment of the French initiative. Give but the hope that Italy and Hungary could act together against the common enemy, forming, in Kossuth's phrase, 'the two wings of one army;' give but the hope that, in any movement begun by the Italians, the Hungarian soldiers serving in the Austrian armies in Italy would

take the field against their masters—give but this hope, and the greatest admirer of the Gauls might consent to admit that Italy might achieve her work without them. Welcome to Mazzini himself, as a modification of his original notion of dependence on an Italian initiative pure and simple, this notion of a Hungarian and Italian alliance as a new power in European politics, came upon even the least sanguine as a revelation that the time-honoured crotchet of a dependence on a French initiative might really begin to be dispensed with. The writer of this paper will never forget a scene which he saw, no later than November last, in one of the public halls of London. It was at a meeting convened by the *Society of the Friends of Italy* to witness the first public appearance of Kossuth and Mazzini together on the same platform. One of the resolutions, moved by Professor Newman, was to the effect, that the meeting ‘hailed the alliance between Hungarian and Italian patriotism, as a symbol of that union between *nations*, as distinguished from *governments*, on which the hope of a better future for Europe must rest.’ In acknowledging this resolution Kossuth used these words (we quote the report of the ‘Daily News’)—

‘Believe me, ladies and gentlemen, I feel deeply, very deeply sensible of your kindness, and of the value of that interest which you manifest for the cause of Italy and Hungary. I thank you for this manifestation the more because, in consonance with the resolution just now adopted, I feel entitled to take such a manifestation not only for an acknowledgment, but for an approval of the brotherly fraternization and alliance between the nation of Italy and the nation of Hungary. And in that respect my best answer, I believe, is, that as thus—(here M. Kossuth, extending his hand across the table, seized that of M. Mazzini, who stood up and reciprocated the proof of amity, amidst the immense applause of the delighted meeting)—that as thus I take up the hand of my friend and brother, Mazzini, and, as I stand here before God and you, hand in hand with him, so, depend upon it, the world will yet see the people of Italy and the people of Hungary not only standing up, but also marching on, side by side, and hand in hand, till those fair parts of the world are restored to the natural, imprescriptible, and inalienable right of every nation to be free, to be independent, and to have and to exercise the sovereign right of every nation to regulate according to its own will its own domestic concerns, and to set up and to set down, and to alter and to change, when it will and how it will, its own government—(tremendous cheering). As to the rest, obedient to your call I have risen, but only for the purpose to apologize for not making a speech. There is a time and a season for everything in the world. There is a time and a season to speak, and there is a time and a season to be silent. You English are happy. You may hope to carry all that you require by the peaceful means of the free word. For us we can nothing carry with words. And therefore I have taken

—in consequence of my duty I have taken—the rule, that for the future I have only a single speech, which is reserved for the due time, and, depend upon it, to be spoken in due time; and that only speech that I have in future is “Up boys, and at them—follow me.” Until I have an occasion to deliver that speech, I will have none else. So am I done with oratory.’

These words were spoken in London on the 10th of November 1852; the Milan insurrection broke out on the 6th of February 1853. We characterize this insurrection properly, therefore, when we say that it was *an attempt on the part of Mazzini (Kossuth not assenting at the final act of deliberation) to put into force the notion that Italy might, by a simultaneous rising of her own people, aided by the chance of Hungarian help within Italy, achieve her own freedom, without so much as asking the leave of the French Fates.* Such we believe to be the correct interpretation of the recent outbreak.

Even at the time when the foregoing words of Kossuth were uttered, the moment for such attempt, the moment for exemplifying the new idea of the substitution of the Hungarian and Italian alliance for the worm-eaten French initiative, seemed to be approaching. We know as a fact that, as early as November or December last, it seemed to Mazzini that things were rushing on in Italy to such a pass that insurrection on some scale or other could not possibly be prevented. And whoever knew what was then taking place in Italy must have had a similar impression. Our English newspapers do not bring over to us one tithe of the horrors which every week and month add to the tremendous heap of crime perpetrated by the divers tyrants against the Italian people; and it would require a special agency of the press, such as that set on foot by the society whose publications we have quoted, to bring these horrors of Italian despotism within acting-distance of British indignation. Our newspapers, however, told us enough to convince anyone that the atrocities going on in the various states of Italy, and especially in Lombardy and the papal states, during the closing months of the last year were such as no country, however patient and desponding, could long endure. Let our readers attend to the following extracts from the ‘Monthly Record of the Society of the Friends of Italy,’ giving a summary of the more conspicuous of these atrocities from month to month.

‘*Wholesale Arrests in Lombardy.*—The most afflicting piece of intelligence that has reached us from Italy for a long time is, the news of the wholesale arrests that have been recently going on in Lombardy and Venice. During the bustle of the elections our readers have probably hardly paid any attention to the slender notices of these terrible incidents which have appeared in the foreign columns of some of our

newspapers. Yet, in real importance, these arrests in Northern Italy surpass almost all the other facts that our newspapers have had to record during the past month. They are already upwards of three hundred in number, and are still going on. The towns where the arrests have principally taken place, are Mantua, Milan, Verona, Brescia, Pavia, Cremona, and Venice. The thing is said to have begun thus:—At Mantua, the police, in searching a house where smuggled goods were supposed to be concealed, came upon one of the Italian loan-notes; the possessor of this note, a person of patriotic leanings, as all Italians, of whatever rank or class are, but not a member of the organised association of patriots which extend over all Italy, was induced to mention the name of the person from whom he had bought the note. This person was arrested; all the letters, even of the most immaterial and private kind, found in his house were seized, and used as indications of new persons to be arrested, the Austrian policy hoping that the very multiplicity and conspicuousness of the arrests would lead to discoveries. Apparently the police succeeded in obtaining some clue which directed them on and on from one person arrested to others and others still; for they did not stop till they had arrested and thrown into prison upwards of one hundred persons in the province of Mantua alone. . . . By a similiar process, the Austrian police made simultaneous arrests in the other towns named. At Venice the persons arrested number between twenty and thirty; and the numbers are proportionate in Milan, Brescia, Verona, Pavia, and Cremona. . . . There have also been arrests at Modena, Massa, and wherever else the Austrians have power. At Milan the most fatal arrest was that of Giovanni Pezzotti, a man of noble character and of distinguished intellectual attainments. Immediately after his arrest he was found dead in prison. The report spread by the officials was that he had strangled himself; but among those who knew the calm and resolute disposition of Pezzotti, and the possibilities of an Austrian dungeon, this report was at first disbelieved. There is reason to believe, however, that Pezzotti did strangle himself—led to this desperate act by a fear lest his integrity should give way under the tortures to which he was sure to be subjected. The day before his arrest, and when he knew it was coming, he expressed this fear to an intimate friend; but said that, come what might, he would take means to save his honour.’—‘Monthly Record’ for August, 1852.

Continued Arrests in Lombardy, and Arrests in the Papal States.—‘In Italy we have to report a continuance of the reign of terror, increasing in persecuting cruelty as it approaches the period of conflict, which may bury it for ever in the past. Arrests *en masse* are no longer confined to the Lombardo-Venetian territory; they take place now in those parts of the Roman States occupied by Austrian garrisons, at Terni, Spoleto, Macerata, Bologna, Ferrara, and Faenza.’—*Ibid*, for October, 1852.

Executions of Political Prisoners in the Papal States.—‘Since the publication of our last ‘Record,’ news has been received of an occurrence in the Roman states more horrible in its individual cruelty than

any which has taken place in Italy since the commencement of the reaction. We allude to the execution of twenty-four political prisoners in Sinigaglia—an atrocity to which, we are very sorry to say, the British press, with one or two exceptions, has hardly done more than allude. The facts are these:—In the last days of September, twenty-four men who had been imprisoned since 1849, on political charges, and who during that time had endured the sufferings, privations, and tortures peculiar to an Italian prison, were led out—eight, the first day; six, the second; and ten, the third—into a public place in the town of Sinigaglia, and there shot by Swiss soldiers in the pay of the pope. . . . The most distinguished of the victims was Girolama Simoncelli, ex-lieutenant of the national guard; a man of the most amiable, generous, and noble character, and universally beloved. Some of the victims may have been guilty of deeds blamed even by the republicans; but Simoncelli was innocent of any approach to a legal offence, and had been declared to be so by the local authorities. At all events, the trials being secret, and there being no guarantee for just proceeding in the Roman states, even according to the laws as they exist, these Sinigaglia executions can be regarded as nothing else than an atrocious act of public cruelty by a government lost to all sense of the world's opinion, and remorseless upon system.'—*Ibid*, for November, 1852.

In addition to the executions here recorded, we may mention that *thirty-six* similar executions took place in the same month in Ancona, another town in the papal states.

Executions at Mantua.—'The most harrowing Italian incident of the month is that alluded to by M. Mazzini in his note read at the Society's last meeting—the execution by garotte of five political prisoners at Mantua. The crime of which they were accused was that of having belonged to, and taken part in, the secret political associations in Mantua and Venice. Ten persons had been condemned by the military commission of Mantua; but the sentences of five were commuted to imprisonment for from four to twelve years. Great exertions were made to save the others; an influential deputation from Mantua waiting on Radetzky at Verona to intercede for them. Radetzky's reply is said to have been: "No blood will be shed,"—an equivocation the meaning of which was made plain by the execution of the five prisoners by garotte, or public strangulation, at Mantua, on the 7th of December. The papers of Turin and Genoa are full of details of this horrible transaction, and of accounts of the victims, all of whom are said to have been greatly respected for their character; and two of whom—the priest Tazzoli and the physician Poma—are said to have been men of high ability and acquirement.'—*Ibid*, for January, 1853.

Such are a specimen of the bare facts—some 250 or 300 arrests in the Lombardo-Venetian territory alone, in July, August, and September, 1852; arrests continued there and in the Roman states during the following months; *sixty* executions

by the papal government, for old political offences, in the single month of October, 1852; *five* executions, by strangulation, at Mantua, of victims selected from among the recently arrested Lombards and Venetians; and hundreds more reserved amid the tortures of Austrian and papal prisons, to be sacrificed as the same policy might dictate. And all this, too, a mere addition to the normal horrors which ever reign in Italy, but of which, because they are normal, European opinion has ceased to take account. Such were the facts; but it requires imagination to fill up the picture. Well might the *Friends of Italy*, in announcing the facts in question, add these words:—

‘If we could but fancy these things as they actually are; if we could conceive them done, not at a distance from us, but somewhere near, so as to come home to our hearts and imaginations; if we could compel ourselves to fancy what is taking place on these plains and in these cities of Northern Italy—a foreign police, aided by a foreign military force, making razzias among the native Italian population, breaking into houses, tearing husbands and brothers and sons from the bosoms of their families, dragging them manacled through the streets and along the highways, to dungeons such as no murderer in England would be lodged in, following them into these dungeons, and employing every ingenious device of torture to make them confess or denounce their friends, sometimes forging documents to deceive them into the belief that others have made confessions, sometimes administering belladonna and other drugs to stupify them into a manageable state of idiocy;—if we could, or would, fancy all this, reason would suggest the rest, and all our despicable pedantries about non-intervention and the like, would give way to a burst of that instinct which should tell us that for any part of the earth to permit such things to go on in any other part of it, however distant, is a blasphemy against brotherhood and human duty.’

If to Englishmen, looking at the state of Italy three months ago, such feelings were natural, what must have been the feelings of the Italian patriots themselves, and especially of Mazzini? Can we wonder that the feeling arose throughout Italy that the time was come for a revolt, and that it would be culpable to delay longer? Can we wonder that, at the very time when Kossuth and Mazzini appeared together on the same English platform, and when Englishmen were preparing their Christmas festivities, Italy and Mazzini should have been exchanging with each other messages and counter-messages, of serious meaning? ‘We must revolt; come over and be with us; come over and direct us,’—such was the call of Italy, through her organization, to her exiled leader. He answered the call; he, who on previous occasions had advised delay and prudence; he who had dissuaded the heroic brothers Bandiera

from the enterprise in which they perished, felt it his duty now to go. The New Year's day had dawned on England, and men were bidding each other salutation in our streets, when Mazzini, intent on another errand, entered the ship which bore him from our shores. His purpose, doubtless, was to go to reconnoitre, to be near the scene of action, and to decide according to what he saw. When he went, it is probable, action had not been determined on in his own mind; it seems certain at least that his friend Kossuth, to whom his departure and its purpose must, of course, have been known, regarded the journey as a mere journey to reconnoitre, and did not fully anticipate that the result of it would be of such an emphatic kind as to call upon him immediately for the fulfilment of his pledge. It was for Mazzini, however, as the representative of Italy, to determine in this case; and Kossuth himself has made public the fact that, when the news of the Milan insurrection reached him, he made instant preparations to set out to be at Mazzini's side.

Mazzini left England in the beginning of January—it was on the 9th of February that the news of the outbreak at Milan on the 6th reached England. The whole history of the affair, all the materials for forming a right opinion as to its prudence and as to the details involved in it, lie in what passed between Mazzini and the chiefs of the internal Italian organization during that month. These materials are not, and probably will never be, fairly before the European public. It is only, therefore, on the more obvious facts attending the outbreak itself that critics of political action have pronounced judgment. That judgment, we believe, has been, in many cases, partial and unjust. It was refreshing, indeed, to witness the amount of sympathy which the news of the revolt evoked in this country; but the criticisms on the prudence of the movement, which accompanied the expression of this sympathy, were founded on the single fact of failure, rather than on an enlarged view of the whole case. Many characterize the affair as a deplorable *emeute*, beginning in nothing and ending in nothing. The following passage, from the last 'Monthly Record of the Friends of Italy,' seems to us to administer the proper corrective to this view, as well as to present, in the most succinct form, an account of nearly all that has been yet ascertained as to the circumstances of the revolt itself. After pointing out, as we have done, the necessary connexion of the revolt with the aggravated cruelties of Austrian rule in Lombardy during the preceding months, the 'Record' proceeds:—

'But, in the second place, this insurrection, so far as appears, was not a mere hasty ill-concocted explosion of irrepressible despair; it

was a deeply-planned inauguration of what was intended to be a national Italian movement. . . . The notion clearly was that there should be a simultaneous or nearly simultaneous rising against the Austrians in all parts of Italy. It is thus and thus alone that a great army, such as that which Austria holds in Italy, can be paralysed and overcome. But even this was not the sole ground of expectation. It seems clearly to have been a second feature of the scheme, that it was to afford an opportunity for the practical exemplification of what has hitherto been only a theory, but a theory pregnant with great effects upon the condition of Europe—the theory of the alliance between Italy and Hungary.

‘The only thing that remains, therefore, to afford the slightest ground for a charge of imprudence, over and above the imprudence which must attach to every act where men dare a great risk in the face of an incalculable future, is the manner of *beginning* the movement. But let the real state of the case be considered. It was necessary that there *should be* a beginning; that this beginning should be in one spot; and that what was intended to become a *conflagration* should at first be a mere *spark*. Milan, judiciously enough for all reasons, was the spot selected. The Milanese had driven out the Austrians before, and were ready to try to do so again; and twenty-four hours of insurrection in Milan would rouse all Lombardy, and even bring Piedmontese strength into Lombardy. . . . In short, the only real allegation against the plan is that it failed. The very nature of the plan, the very fact that it *was* a plan, is hidden beneath the circumstance of failure. Now failure was possible in any case, and even failure at the beginning; but there is reason, from the accounts received, to believe that the failure arose from a departure from the strict order of the plan as it had been laid down. Treachery or indiscreet babbling had forewarned the Austrians; this was known, and the word was given by the patriotic leaders to refrain. It was too late, however; the boldest and least patient, feeling themselves compromised, would not wait; and the insurrection was begun. It was crushed.’

Since this account was published there has appeared a document of great interest, substantially confirming it, but adding some particulars, from the pen of one of Mazzini's most noble-hearted associates in the enterprise, his former fellow-triumvir, Aurelio Saffi, whose name appeared along with that of Mazzini appended to the Milan proclamation. Saffi, a young and thoughtful man of letters, had undertaken a soldier's part in the movement, with whose preparation he was concerned. He had courageously gone into the papal states, to undertake the Roman department of the general movement of which the Milan rising was to be the signal; and for many days after the abortive result of that rising, there were great apprehensions as to his safety. These apprehensions were at length relieved by a letter from himself to a Genoese newspaper, written from a

place not named, and dated February 27th. In this letter he thus modestly speaks of his own share in the projected movement, and of his own opinions as to its prudence and likelihood:—

‘I remained near my friend until the close of last month, and having acquired undeniable proofs of the magnanimous wishes of the people of Milan, I parted with Mazzini on the day appointed for action, in order to go and announce that determination to other Italian provinces, ready to co-operate in the rising. I witnessed the preparations for the enterprise, but am not aware of the immediate causes of its failure. Whatever those causes may have been, I am more convinced than ever, by the grandeur of the popular acts, which have not been tarnished by want of success, that the faith which dictated to Joseph Mazzini his appeal to the Italians was not a snare, and that, if the enterprise failed, it was not because the advice was imprudent, or the people deficient in courage or goodwill. The statement which my friend will, I trust, soon publish, for the sake of truth, to satisfy the conscience and furnish correct materials for the history of the nation, will show that while men of the higher ranks of society remained indifferent or hopeless, the people of Milan, abandoned without direction to their own instinct, confided in the destinies of the country, and unanimously resolved to avenge themselves for the despotism of Austrian proconsuls and the judicial assassinations of the military commissions; that the part we took in the movement, which was secretly prepared in brotherly popular associations, did not precede, but followed the firm determination of the oppressed; and that it was imposed upon us by a sacred duty as Italians, in the conviction of the indomitable courage of a people who, whatever might be our opinion, had sworn to restore Italy by a supreme effort to a station to which she has a right to pretend. The central provinces of Italy shared in those dispositions of the Lombards, whom they were ready to imitate. I traversed them under the protection of their inhabitants; I found them all animated with the same sentiments; and, if the rising in the capital of Lombardy had succeeded, every one of them, notwithstanding the want of arms, would have responded to the appeal.’

What an illustration of the state of Italy in the fact stated in this letter! Saffi, a Roman, once triumvir of Rome, penetrates into the heart of the papal states; traverses the papal provinces; converses with the people and their chiefs, where a single betrayal would have cost him his life; yet emerges safe and untouched after weeks of activity, because he travelled ‘under the protection of the inhabitants!’ Truly the Romans must be well affected towards the papal government!

The Milan insurrection, therefore, according to the best information yet at our command is to be thus defined—the *prelude and first act of an extensive prepared plan for putting in force the idea of Mazzini and the national Italian party, that the*

freedom of Italy is to be achieved by a general insurrection of the Italian people, trusting to the collateral help of the Hungarians in Italy ; which prelude and first act was cut short by unforeseen circumstances, so as to make it necessary to arrest the movement at that stage, and leave the remainder of the plan unseen, unexplained, and, for practical purposes, intact. Such was the thing itself ; and now for a word or two as to its consequences.

Within Italy itself the consequence has been that the battle between the despots and the Italian people has been advanced a step, and that in favour of the Italian people. This, which seemed doubtful at first, is now plain. The Milan rising, instead of proving, as some anticipated, a blow and discouragement to the cause of Italian liberty, has had a reverse effect. On the one hand, it is true, it has been followed, in Northern Italy at least, by an immense increase of tyrannical rigour. The scaffold in Milan has had its tens of victims, and will have more. Measures unparalleled even in Austrian annals have been adopted by Radetzky and his subordinates against the whole population of Milan, and against the Lombards in general. But the feeling excited by these measures even among those who are not unfriendly to Austria is, *Quos Deus vult perdere prius dementat*. The undistinguishing fury of Radetzky's punishments, involving alike the nobles, the middle classes, and the populace, must tend to crush the last reluctant relics of moderatism in Lombardy into the embrace of the national party. On the other hand the attempt has revealed to the national party much that it could only have learnt by such an experiment. It has told them where their strength lies, and what are their elements of weakness. The preparation of such an attempt was like a schedule of queries addressed to the various parts of the Italian population—the Lombards, the Venetians, the Romans, the Tuscans, the Sicilians ; and that schedule of queries remains filled up. Moreover (and this is a great point), that part of the insurrectionary plan which remained intact and undisclosed, in consequence of the failure of the first step, may possibly stand good for another time. All Italy has been communicated with ; trains of powder have been laid, from city to city, along Lombardy, the Roman states, and the Sicilies ; these trains did not catch fire from the Milan explosion, but they lie ready for the application of the torch at any new spot that may be selected. The only respect in which it might at first seem that the failure of the Milan rising had permanently damaged the scheme of which it was a prearranged part, is in so far as that scheme was founded on the alliance between Italy and Hungary. The disclaimer by Kossuth of the proclamation issued at Milan in his name may have seemed like a declara-

tion of the dissolution for the time being of that alliance as an operative fact. But this, which was in the nature of things impossible, has been amply contradicted in the face of all by the subsequent declaration of Kossuth, that, whatever may have been his opinion as to the turn given to his previous pledges by those who presided over the Milan affair, and whatever precautions he may see fit to take in future as to the use of his name in Italy, the alliance not only between Hungary and Italy, but between himself as the representative of Hungary and Mazzini as the representative of Italy, subsists still.

Out of Italy, the effect of the Milan affair, as we have already said, may be summed up in this, that it has re-opened the European question. It has let loose, in particular, a flood of speculations as to the future of Italy, almost of all of which are characterized by hostility to the rule of Austria. Among these *one* deserves to be specially mentioned—the revival, namely, in a new form of the everlasting notion of the French initiative. Italy, it is said, is lost to Austria, and is flung into the arms of France. Louis Napoleon, it is said, waits but for the little incident on which he has set his heart—his coronation at Paris by the pope; after which we shall see him dip his hand into the mysterious bag of his mind, where all the *Idées Napoléoniennes* lie, and bring out one splendid card more, with the word ‘Italy’ inscribed upon it. With Rome already in his hands, with Murats to let loose upon Naples, and with thousands in Northern Italy ready to exchange Austrian tyranny for anything one shade less horrible, he may play, it is said, a great Italian game. The future of Italy, according to this interpretation, will be a joint-affair between France and Piedmont. And what renders this speculation more ominous is the fact, to which we would beg particular attention, that the ‘Times’ has taken it up. Within the last week or two there have been several articles in the ‘Times,’ written specially in advocacy of the transference of Italy from Austria to France. To those who watch the signs of the times, this is a most important symptom. Let it be remembered on the 12th of this month, when Mr. Duncombe brings on his motion in the House of Commons as to the continued occupation of Rome by the armies of Austria and France.

As regards England, the effect of the Milan insurrection has been to put both the country and the government in a position in which they must speak their mind more plainly as to how they will stand with Austria and with despotism in general. To the insolent demand, indeed, that England should expel or give up Mazzini, Kossuth, and other refugees, our ministry and our whole political staff on all sides have sent back a flat refusal; and with this refusal Austria must perforce be content.

But the matter does not rest here. The Austrian Government, it is said, are at this moment preparing a bill of indictment against the refugees and others, charging them with direct infringement of the English law, which prohibits the citizens of this country, and those enjoying its hospitality, from levying or subsidizing war against any of her Majesty's allies. The Aberdeen ministry have pledged themselves to prosecute under such an indictment. There is a chance, therefore, of the question as between Austria and Italy being brought before a British jury. If so, the result is certain. The verdict of such a jury will be but the declaration of what, sooner or later, will have to be declared in some way or other by England to Austria—a declaration which might come direct from our government, were our government bold enough, but which may, after all, come with better effect from a jury taken from the heart of the British people. That declaration will in substance be this,—‘Austrian despots, come into our courts no more; you are no allies of ours, but our natural enemies. We hate you, we despise you, and we wish the world well rid of you. Bluster as you like, take to arms if you like; that is our opinion, and we do not care a rush for your anger. Be content if, in our constitutional prudence and indisposition to meddle with other people's quarrels, we do not openly assist the Italians against you; and do not insult us, by expecting us to help *you* against *them*. The Italians, we tell you, have our sympathies, and not you; they are brave men struggling for their rights, and it would do our hearts good to see them succeed. They may blunder and stumble on in confusion for awhile, as new beginners must; but their worst will be better than your best. You talk of war, do you? Take care; we go great lengths when we are roused; and it is just possible that you may drive us farther that we would go at present; and dispose us not merely to sympathize with Italy, but to lend her a helping hand.’ It will be a proud day for England when, whether through government or through jury, she speaks her mind in such a strain. And has not America, through the mouth of the new president, set her a glorious example?

Brief Notices.

The Imperial Gazetteer ; a General Dictionary of Geography, Physical, Political, Statistical, and Descriptive. Compiled from the latest and best authorities. Edited by W. G. Blackie, Ph. D. Imperial 8vo. Vol. I. pp. 1308. Glasgow, Edinburgh and London: Blackie and Son.

FEW works are more useful than a gazetteer. It is second only to a dictionary, if, indeed, it is inferior even to it. As a book of reference, it is in perpetual demand, and its subjects being multitudinous, and very various, a large amount of knowledge is required in order to its preparation. The vast extent of topics which it embraces renders discriminating judgment and sound scholarship, absolutely needful to its compilation. Ordinary gazetteers are amongst the most unattractive books in our language. It is difficult to imagine anything more repulsive than the works which have been provided under this title. We should as soon think of reading 'Johnson's Dictionary,' or 'Cruden's Concordance' continuously, as of employing an hour in the perusal of the gazetteers furnished to our fathers. Yet it is obvious to remark that there is no necessity for this. The nature of the work does not entail any such dulness. On the contrary, there is very much in the contents of a gazetteer which, if judiciously arranged, and narrated in due proportion, might serve to interest, as well as to inform,—to employ the leisure hour of a casual reader, as well as to meet the demands of the inquiring and studious. The work now before us is constructed on a plan which promises to secure many of these advantages. Irrelevant and trifling matters will be omitted, the largest amount of information is to be compressed within the narrowest possible limits, the most recent and authentic sources will be consulted, and 'particular attention will be paid to the trade and resources of the various places described; and to the social condition, manners, customs, &c., of the inhabitants.' The editors of such works have usually contented themselves with re-casting old materials, but the 'Imperial Gazetteer' is to be an entirely new work, founded on the larger information and more accurate science of the day. 'It is not intended to present the reader with lengthy, wearisome treatises, but with concise, readable articles, occupying a position between the scientific and the popular, retaining the precision of the one without its abstruseness, and the interest of the other without its vagueness.' The work is profusely illustrated with engravings on wood, printed in the text, and—judging from the specimen before us—they form a very valuable and improving feature of the publication. In number they will be seven hundred at least, and the style of their execution is as good as their purpose is useful. From

personal examination, we feel qualified to speak unhesitatingly of the great superiority of the present work to all others of its class with which we are acquainted. It leaves them far behind, and supplies what has long been needed, 'a concise repertory of new and interesting information.' As such it should find an immediate place in every library, and will be an invaluable book of reference, both to the teacher and the scholar; the man of general intelligence, the student of philosophy, and the inquirer into the history, habits, and condition of various peoples. The work is published in parts, and is thus happily brought within the means of a very large class. We have not often been disposed to speak so strongly in commendation of a work, but in proportion as its merits are known it will be highly appreciated.

The Scripture Warrant ; or, Congregationalism and its Reformers.

By Andrew Reed, B.A., Minister of the Old Meeting House.
Norwich. London : Ward & Co.

THIS treatise has been occasioned by a movement in Norwich, which indicates much unsettlement in the minds of some members of congregational churches in that city. The main points of discussion have been the exclusive teaching of the pastor, the recognition of social distinctions in the church, and the modes of contributing towards the expenses of public worship. That the holding of conferences, at which resolutions are drawn up to be propounded as 'the basis of a kindly but earnest discussion,' is a violation of the independence of churches, appears to us to be self-evident, and a course which we most unhesitatingly condemn. It is an organization external to the church, designed to revolutionize the church. Besides this fundamental evil, against which it behoves all free churches to be on their guard quite as much as against the interference of synods, bishops, or parliaments, the objects for the sake of which this unconstitutional innovation has been made are such as we judge to be subversive of the distinctive principles in which the real strength of the congregational churches is found. Institutions which have their warrant in the New Testament are likely to be assailed, not only from without, but also from within ; and the details which have been arranged by the common sense and experience to which they are manifestly left in Scripture, are threatened to be disturbed by theories which have been tried, but have always failed. There is such a thing as the popery of dissent—the bondage generated by the abuse of freedom—the narrow-mindedness of jealousy—the casuistry of discontent. Individuals who have more of this than of the hearty confidence which is the cement of Christian communities are to be found nearly everywhere. They have but one kind of power—that of irritating and annoying. If they were united into one body they would fall to pieces from inherent weakness. Though we would not exaggerate a local demonstration of this kind, we think it quite as well that the arguments by which the parties make way should be calmly dealt with, while a soberer mode of looking at what they complain of as evils should preoccupy the minds of those to whom they

appeal for sympathy. This is what Mr. Reed has done. And he has done it well. The book is honourable alike to his judgment and to his spirit. Far from denying that there are imperfections to be removed, or improvements to be made, in congregational churches, he maintains, most justly, that each church has the power of examining both the one and the other, and of acting for itself. We are not sorry that the work has fallen into the hands of a writer who is known to be fully imbued with the true spirit of reform, but who proves himself too wise a man to be deluded by every plausibility that assumes the name. We hope this very ably written little treatise will be read with much advantage by the members of independent churches generally throughout the empire, and we should be glad to know that it is extensively read by as many as need to be informed on the actual working of such churches.

Ecclesiography; or, the Biblical Church Analytically Delineated. By John G. Manly. London: Partridge and Oakey. 1852.

VERY little in this work will be new to the bulk of our readers beyond its title, the stately formality of its arrangement, and the abundance of pedantic forms of expression, such as 'Formational Summary,' 'Collateral Circumspectiveness,' 'Chronal Origin,' and the like. Mr. Manly professes, in the main, what is usually understood by Independent or Congregational Church order. Having reached his own conclusions in his own way, we leave him to expound them after his own fashion; yet we think he would have been better understood, and consequently more useful, if he had acquired more of the perspicuity and ease of good English writing. Many readers, ourselves among them, prefer the showing of proofs and reasons to the perpetual assertion of controverted judgments, as though they were intuitively certain. We presume that Mr. Manly is a young writer; if so, we advise him to study the best models, and to choose always the plainest words. The English language is full enough, rich enough, in words, for all the ends of Christian teaching. The substance of the work is good—better than its shape. Such is our judgment. Yet to many readers the logical form of this work will be one of its recommendations. The writer has a clear and strong mind, and exhibits a more complete view of the church, in all its aspects and relations, and more in agreement with the New Testament, than will be found elsewhere. We are particularly struck with the thorough investigation of the Gospels as recording the *preparations* for the church, and with the prominence given to the Holy Spirit as the 'CALLER' of the 'called.' The work is divided into six parts. Part I. Import of the Church, or Ecclesiastical Nature, treated in four chapters on the Genius of the Church; Species of the Church; Individuality of the Church; Definition of the Church.—Part II. Rise of the Church, or Ecclesiastical Origin, in five chapters, on the Church Divine—Apostolical—Pentecostal—Palestinian—Appropriately Formed.—Part III. Position of the Church, or Ecclesiastical Relations—including three chapters on

Circumspective Church Relations—Retrospective Church Relations—Prospective Church Relations.—Part IV. Work of the Church, or Ecclesiastical Operation, detailed in three chapters on Government and Ecclesiastical Operation considered as legislative, administrative, material, modal, resultant.—Part V. Oneness of the Church, or Ecclesiastical Unity, as regarded in the Whole Church—a Single Church—and Summary and Result.—Part VI. Sequel of the Church, or Ecclesiastical Destiny.—The general tone of the volume, together with some indistinct allusions in the introduction and occasional pages, seems to indicate that the writer has been connected with the Wesleyan society; yet he 'writes under the auspices of no sect or association whatever, but merely from the felt necessity for some scriptural and systematic analysis of spiritual society, and with the single aim to seek and tell the truth.'

A Commentary of Medical and Moral Life, or Mind and the Emotions, considered in their relations to Health, Disease, and Religion. By William Cooke, M.D., M.R.C.S. London: Longman and Co. 1852.

THE author of this 'commentary' has here compressed within the limits of a readable volume a large amount of information gathered in the course of a lengthened medical practice. With a due admixture of scientific intelligence expressed in popular language, and of valuable suggestions derived from experience, he has adopted a mode of treating not a few difficulties relating to religion, which is in good keeping with his profession as a physician, and with his principles as a Christian. The work is divided into seven chapters on Introductory Views—The Material Instruments of Mental and Moral Action—Temperament as modifying the Mind and Emotions—The Distinct Emotions, and their relations to Health, Disease, and Religion—Mind and the Emotions influenced by States of Body—Mind and the Emotions as a Medical Agency in the relief or cure of Disease—The preceding subjects briefly considered in relation to the Duration of Life and Life Insurance. On each of these topics the author's instructions are clear, calm, and useful; enlivened, at intervals, by interesting facts, and pervaded throughout by a dignified tone of benevolence, hallowed by the spirit of manly piety. Our medical readers will not reject the seriousness with which the writer urges on them the cultivation of personal religion, not only as their own dearest interest, but also as endowing them with great power in the treatment of innumerable cases of disease. The educationist will be glad of so seasonable a help in the difficult work of training both boys and girls. To the Christian pastor these pages are replete with counsels, which it is not wise to slight. It is because we believe that the work is wisely conceived, ably executed, well timed, and likely to do much good, that we wish it to be extensively read: it relates to matters which it is desirable that every one should understand; and the style in which it is written is neither technical nor loose, but adapted at once to the subject, and to the average capacities of the community.

Lights of the World ; or, Illustrations of Character drawn from the Records of Christian Life. By the Rev. John Stoughton. London: The Religious Tract Society.

MR. STOUGHTON has been remarkably happy in the conception of this excellent little work, and has worked it out in a manner that is at once attractive and useful. It is certainly more scriptural, more natural, and unspeakably more interesting, to portray the features of Christianity in their living forms than in the cold abstractions of reason, or the invented pictures of the fancy ; and there is wisdom in selecting the particular virtue exhibited most prominently in separate men, rather than in the indiscriminate laudation of good men, whose memory is sacred. The names are chosen on a Catholic principle, and the reader will at once recognise the appropriateness of each special virtue to the name with which it is here conjoined. 'Thomas Tyndale ; or, Labour and Patience'—'Richard Hooker ; or, a Soul in Love with God's Law and Holy Order'—'Robert Leighton ; or, the Peacefulness of Faith'—'Sir Matthew Hale ; or, Secular Diligence and Spiritual Fervour'—'The Honourable Robert Boyle ; or, the Christian Philosopher'—'John Bunyan ; or, Spiritual Valour and Victory'—'Richard Baxter ; or, Earnest Decision'—'Matthew Henry ; or, Meekness of Wisdom'—'George Whitfield ; or, Seraph-like Zeal'—'John William Fletcher, of Madely ; or, Intense Devotion'—'John Newton ; or, Social Affections Sanctified'—'Henry Martyn ; or, Self-denial.' No one can read these illustrations without admiring the genial sympathy of the writer with all the virtues with which Christianity adorns and dignifies the human character, his graphic power, his cheerful earnestness, and his devotion to the best interests of an intelligent, warm, and healthful piety. He has opened a rich mine. We hope he will continue to work it.

The Path of Good Men. (A collection of Hebrew MSS. in the Bodleian Library, Oxford). By Hersch Edelmänn. Translated into English by M. H. Breslaw. London: printed by Shaw and Co., in Camomile-street, Bishopsgate, 5612. 1852.

THIS is an interesting collection in itself, rendered still more so as a proof that the sons of Israel are touched with the spirit of the age. To Hebrew students the instructions of Rabbi Judah Ben Saul Aben Tibbon, and of Rabbi Moses Maimonides for their sons, both in English and in Hebrew, together with ancient Arabic and Greek Proverbs rendered into Hebrew, are literary curiosities too attractive to need any recommendation of ours.

The Journal of Sacred Literature. January, 1853. London: Blackader.

DR. KITTO sustains the character of his Journal well by the interesting contents of this Number. The rarity of Greek and Roman classical allusions to Christianity is pleasingly accounted for by a well-instructed and discriminating writer. The rather long and heavy series of chapters on 'The Rephaim,' which have engaged the attention of readers

for whom this Journal is specially designed, is at length completed. The 'Memoir of Moses Stuart' will be grateful to all cultivators of biblical learning, as will also be the portion of 'Ewald on the Prophets.' The papers on miscellaneous subjects—'The Resurrection,' 'Confession,' 'Hebrew Literature,' 'The Spirits in Prison,' 'Hippolytus,' &c., are of varied interest.

Review of the Month.

THE MAYNOOTH GRANT WAS AGAIN SUBMITTED TO THE COMMONS ON THE 22ND OF FEBRUARY, in the shape of a motion, proposed by Mr. Spooner, for the withdrawal of money grants from the college. In the debate which followed imperfect views and ecclesiastical bigotry on the one side, were blended with indiscriminate impeachment and equal bigotry on the other. In the last parliament Mr. Spooner asked only for inquiry, but his friends were then in office, and he did not want to increase their difficulties. Now, however, he feels no such reluctance,—nay, it is probable he prefers that course which, while it accomplishes his purpose, adds most effectually to the perplexities of his political opponents. At any rate—such was his statement—there was no ground for further inquiry. His case was admitted; and he called on the House at once and without scruple to do its duty, by withdrawing its grants from the College of Maynooth. Mr. Scholefield moved an amendment to the effect that the attention of the house be directed to 'all enactments now in force, whereby the revenue of the state is charged in aid of any ecclesiastical or religious purposes whatsoever, with a view to the repeal of such enactments.' This amendment was skilfully framed to test both sides of the House. It is easy for political Protestants to declaim against a grant of public money for the support of a popish college; and for Catholics, on the other hand, to include all Protestants in a sweeping charge of narrow-mindedness and intolerance. But what comes from all this, save mutual exasperation? There is much noise, a great dust is raised, party passion is roused, party strength tested, but the whole constitutes a miserable display of the worst features of religious partizanship. We are thoroughly weary of such displays. They have been repeated *ad nauseam*, and we crave something better, more healthy, and of sounder principle. Now Mr. Scholefield's amendment is just this, and hence we like it. It raises the question above the level of party, scatters the mist in which it has been encircled, takes it out of the charge of bigotry, and places it, where it ought ever to be, in the clear light of truth and equal justice. 'If,' said Mr. Fox, with mingled truth and irony, 'the honorable member (Mr. Spooner) adopted the amendment, it would give a dignity to his resolution which it did not now possess, because it substituted a general protest against all similar grants for a mere declaration of sectarian hostility.'

Much as we are opposed to the grant of public money to Maynooth, we could not have voted for Mr. Spooner's motion; since, as was rightly observed by the honorable member for Rochdale, we 'should thereby constitute the state a judge between truth and error in religious things.' The division on Mr. Spooner's motion took place on the 23rd of Feb., when the numbers were, for the motion, 162, and against it, 192, leaving the honorable member for North Warwickshire in a minority of 30. Mr. Scholefield's amendment was debated on the 2nd, and the first speaker was the new member for Sheffield, of whom dissenters may well be proud. Mr. Hadfield is evidently prepared to carry into the House the same fearless assertion of principle which has distinguished him out of it. 'I stand here,' said he, 'with no small pride, representing as I do, the nonconformists, who, with 21,000 congregations in England and Wales, receive not one farthing of public money.' Such language must sound strangely to the old frequenters of St. Stephen's. It would have been enough in past days to consign the speaker to Coventry, but the times are changed; we are in a state of transition, and sixty-eight members were consequently found recording their votes in support of Mr. Scholefield's amendment. The numbers on the division were, 68 for the motion, and 262 against it. The debates to which this question has given rise will do good. They serve to evince the more lofty and equitable views entertained by our friends, and afford an illustration of the manner in which the truth may be propounded with most effect, and with least of a polemical air. A cause which starts with such a minority may calculate on a certain and not very distant triumph.

THE ADMISSION OF JEWS TO PARLIAMENT was the subject of discussion in the Lower House on the 24th of February. It was introduced by Lord John Russell in a speech of large and generous views, and was met—so far as speaking goes—by one of the feeblest oppositions ever encountered by a British statesman. Sir Robert Inglis and Colonel Sibthorpe were of course amongst the most prominent opponents of the measure,—the former on a theory systematically intolerant, and the latter on the ground of doing as he had been accustomed to do. 'He maintained'—such were the religious views of the honorable member for Lincoln—'that the legislature had no right to adulterate such an assembly by his (Baron Rothschild's) admission.' The son of Sir Robert Peel—inheriting the title without the genius of his father—avowed the sacrifice of his predilections on the ground of religious scruples, and took rank with Sir Robert Inglis and Colonel Sibthorpe. Poor Christianity! how sadly is she wronged by many who assume her name, while they misapprehend her spirit, and violate her plainest laws! That such men as the gallant colonel and Sir Robert Peel should imagine themselves to be the upholders and defenders of Christianity is strange indeed; but that their position as members of the legislature should be supposed to warrant the utterance of religious professions, and the avowal of religious zeal, is clear proof that there is something rotten in the state of Denmark. Let such men do anything rather than affect the religious. We hate cant, wherever it is

found, and know no reason why it should be treated more leniently in St. Stephen's than elsewhere. Lord John's motion, that the House resolve itself into a committee, was carried by a majority of 29 only, the numbers being 234 for, and 205 against it. The following resolution was then adopted, and ordered to be reported to the House:— 'That it is expedient to remove all the civil disabilities at present affecting her Majesty's subjects of the Jewish persuasion, in like manner and with the like exception as in the case of her Majesty's subjects professing the Roman-catholic religion.' The smallness of the majority seems to indicate that ministers did not expect a division at so early a stage. Had they done so, they would scarcely have failed to muster their forces in larger numbers. The division also shows the inutility of abandoning sound principles in order to conciliate unreflecting opponents. The measure introduced by Lord John is reduced to the lowest possible level. It is directed simply to the one object of admitting the Jews to parliament, and yet the majority in its favor is less than that which supported the larger and more consistent propositions of former years.

The second reading of the bill took place on the 11th, and we are glad to report that the majority was increased to 51, the numbers being 263 for, and 212 against it. With all respect for senatorial wisdom, we must say that much nonsense was talked on the occasion, by Mr. Newdegate and others, of which our very children would be ashamed. What sort of notion can be entertained of religion by those who affirm that the law excluding Jews is 'the barrier between the Christianity of the house and the introduction of downright Atheism?' Better be without such Christianity than indulge the spirit, and rely on the argumentation, to which some British senators are so much addicted. The bill passed through committee on the 14th, and the third reading is postponed to the 11th of April.

ON THE 1ST MR. W. WILLIAMS MOVED, 'THAT IN THE OPINION OF THIS HOUSE, real property should be made to pay the same probate and legacy duties, as are now payable on personal property.' The tendency of such a measure would be to augment the public income, by a large extension of what it is now fashionable to term, the area of taxation. The amount of legacy duty paid in 1851 was £1,315,380, and that of probate duty £1,063,400. To this fund the bulk of the standing property of the kingdom made no contribution, and to such an extent, therefore, the more wealthy classes, by whom this property is held, were exempted from taxation. This inequality has long been complained of, and many efforts have been made to redress it. These have hitherto failed, but the growing intelligence of the people, their increased weight in the legislature, and the obvious tendency of the public mind, both in and out of parliament, towards direct taxation, indicate that the exemption must ere long be abolished. Mr. Williams's motion was of course opposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and on a division it was lost by a majority of 53, the numbers being for the resolution 71, and against it 124. We are not surprised at this result, nor would we have our economical reformers to be dis-

couraged. Their case is clear and simple. It is easily apprehended by the popular mind, and has all the advantage of increasing the revenue while it removes a monstrous wrong. Our whole system of taxation calls for review, and cannot much longer resist the intrusion of a more equitable principle than has hitherto been applied. The interests of the nation, rather than of a class, must be consulted.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS WERE THE SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION ON THE 1ST, and it has rarely happened that so much unanimity prevailed in the House. Mr. Collier, M.P. for Plymouth, moved the appointment of a committee to consider whether these courts might not be advantageously abolished, and supported his proposal by such an array of facts and force of logic, as precluded the possibility of successful resistance. 'Of all the abuses existing in this country there were none,' said the honourable member, 'comparable with that of the Ecclesiastical Courts.' Again and again, have they been condemned by parliamentary commissions and committees, yet they continue the opprobrium of our legislature, and the fruitful source of litigation. At present they number three hundred and seventy-two, and constitute a national grievance which ought to be promptly and effectually remedied. The Solicitor and Attorney-General avowed their entire concurrence with Mr. Collier,—the former expressing his hope that the remedy 'might be applied even further than the honorable and learned member had suggested,' and the latter declaring that 'they were all agreed that the abuses of the Ecclesiastical Courts were intolerable, and could no longer be endured.' Lord Palmerston also took part in the debate, assuring the House that the Government was in earnest 'in their intention to sweep away—to clear out, I may say—this Augean stable.' With these assurances Mr. Collier was satisfied, and wisely withdrew his motion. Even Dr. Phillimore admitted the necessity for reform, and we rejoice at length to believe that there is some prospect of these anomalous and unrighteous tribunals being consigned to the records of history. A clearer case never existed, and it remains with the country to see that the 'sentence' affirmed by Mr. Collier to have been passed on these courts, is duly executed.

THE CANADA RESERVES BILL has been the occasion of an unseemly rencontre during the month. The decorum and gravity of the Upper House were disturbed on the 28th of February by the Bishop of Exeter, who, with characteristic intemperence, preferred some heavy charges against his brother of Oxford, declaring that what he had said 'was not only not true, but was the very contrary of truth.' The latter prelate disclosed the pet theory of his class of churchmen, while the Bishop of London, less prudent or more honest, joined the former in denouncing the measure as replete with spoliation, if not of sacrilege. It is evident that warm and acrimonious debates will characterize the Upper House whenever the bill is introduced there. In the Commons the second reading was carried on the 4th by 275 against 192. The opposition was led by Sir John Pakington, who was replied to by Sir W. Molesworth in a masterly speech, 'showing,' as the *Nonconformist* truly remarks, 'an appreciation of great principles which we were not prepared to expect,

and a knowledge of the history of the question which rendered his position impregnable.' Mr. Gladstone spoke on the same side with an explicitness—so far as the immediate question was concerned—for which we did not look. Thus far, all was well and full of promise. That the Aberdeen ministry should have courage, to refer the settlement of this long litigated subject to the Canadian legislature is greatly to their honour; and we had hoped that their measure would be passed in such a shape, as would not only allay agitation in the colony, but prevent its recurrence in our own legislature. In this, however, we are disappointed. Church influence has availed to effect a compromise, into the secret history of which we should like to penetrate. This, however, is forbidden. We must be content to know only what ministers are pleased to divulge, and this, of course, is little enough. It is in vain to conjecture, but the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the 18th certainly warrants Mr. Disraeli's surmise, that there are differences of opinion on the subject within the cabinet.

The bill consisted of three clauses only, the last of which was in the following words—'That so much of the said act of the third and fourth year of her Majesty, chapter seventy-eight, as charges the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland with, or authorizes any payment thereout, of the sums needed to supply such deficiency, as in the act mentioned, shall, from and after the passing of the act, be repealed.' This clause Lord John proposed to omit, and frankly stated the history of the guarantee to which it referred. From his explanation it appears that a settlement of the Clergy Reserves was strongly urged by Lord Sydenham in 1840 on the imperial government, as absolutely needful to a union of the two Canadas. The ministry of the day were anxious to effect this union, but were threatened with an opposition in the Upper House, fatal to their policy. In order to parry off such opposition, they entered into a compromise with the bishops, by which a guarantee was given upon the Consolidated Fund, of £7700 to the clergy of the church of England, and of £1580 to the clergy of the church of Scotland, that being the amount then received by the clergy of the two churches. This guarantee was to take effect only in the event of the Clergy Reserves failing to produce the required amount, and hitherto there has been no occasion to enforce it. The omission of this clause was opposed by Mr. Miall, Mr. Bright, and others, as only suited to defer to a future and less favorable opportunity the settlements which ought to be made at present. 'However fair, honest, and good,' said the first of these gentlemen, 'the original conceptions of the noble lord, the member for the City of London, might be, some mysterious influence intervened when they affected church affairs.' We rejoice that his lordship is fairly admonished of the light in which his ecclesiastical legislation is regarded by the country. It is characteristic of his party to quail before the church. Some passages of their history may serve to explain the fact, but cannot diminish our sense of the injury it has done to the progress of sound legislation. 'If,' said Mr. Bright, 'the noble lord would only learn to rely upon what was just, and upon

what might be fairly recommended to the honest judgment of the people of this country, he believed the noble lord would find far more support than he usually calculated upon in carrying his measures through both Houses of Parliament.'

Sir George Grey, who voted for the omission, affirmed that on a careful perusal of the act of 1840, he 'came to the same conclusion as the honorable member for Manchester as to the nature and extent of the guarantee comprised in the eighth clause of that act.' His view was simply this, 'that it was not in the contemplation of the legislature when the act (1840) was passed to give any guarantee against such a contingency as was now under consideration—he meant the absolute secularization of the fund arising from the reserves.' This, we believe to be the sound view of the case. The security was contingent, and ceases immediately that the *Reserves* are applied to other purposes than that contemplated in the act of 1840. Ministers were, of course, aided in the division by their conservative opponents—eighty-four of whom voted with them—and the omission was carried by 176 against 108. Had the question been left to the decision of the liberal members, Lord John would have found himself in a minority. Of those who voted on the 2nd, in support of Mr. Scholefield's amendment, 26 were absent on the 18th; and we are sorry to find that many of the metropolitan members were amongst the number.

THE LAW OF PROBATES, AT PRESENT VEXATIOUS AND EXPENSIVE, was the subject of consideration on the 8th, when Mr. Hadfield introduced a bill, with the sanction of the Solicitor-General, to render one probate of a will sufficient, and to constitute such probate 'proof of the devise of a real estate in the same manner as it was of a personal estate.' Mr. Phillimore admitted the necessity for reform, and instanced a case in which 'for one and the same instrument, it was necessary to have a probate in Canterbury, another in York, letters of administration in Scotland, and a certified copy of the will from the colonies.' We trust that the honorable member for Sheffield will succeed in carrying his measure through the House. The present state of the law is most unsatisfactory, and answers no purpose but that of entailing needless expenditure and much vexation. Our friends cannot do better than let the country see the interest they take in the redress of such national grievances.

THE ELECTION COMMITTEES HAVE BEEN DOING THEIR WORK THOROUGHLY, but the state of the law prevents their visiting with due punishment the most guilty parties. Many members have been unseated; inquiries into the corrupt practices of several boroughs are pending; but the agents concerned in such practices, and by whose instrumentality they have been carried on, have escaped. We are glad to see that this anomaly is engaging attention, and hope that some measure will speedily be devised by which it may be corrected. What has recently been divulged shows the necessity for some stringent enactment, nor can we see why any elector guilty of offering or taking a bribe should not be deprived of the franchise, and every candidate cognizant of such practices be declared disqualified *in perpetuo*

for a seat in Parliament. We are more than ever convinced that these mal-practices may be put down, if our statesmen are but honestly concerned to effect this end. The evil has now attained such magnitude, and is become so notorious, that some remedy must be attempted. Let us hope it will not be a delusive one. We are not amongst those who look to the ballot as a *panacea* for all electoral misdoings, but we do believe that it will greatly contribute to their correction, and must precede a complete eradication of them. About twenty election committees have already reported, and the following is the result of their labors. We are glad to find that their inquiries have hitherto been happily exempt from party bias, and trust this impartiality will be continued. For a liberal candidate—under *any* circumstances—to resort to bribery, is to show his utter inappreciation of the principles professed, and his disloyalty to the cause he advocates. Let Tories resort to such unconstitutional means if they think fit, but let the friends of popular freedom submit to a hundred defeats rather than adopt a practice which undermines the morality and patriotism that constitute our strength. The following are the results of the election committees up to the adjournment of the House:—

MEMBERS UNSEATED FOR BRIBERY AND CORRUPTION.

<i>Conservatives.</i>		<i>Liberals.</i>	
Bridgnorth . . .	Sir R. Pigott	Blackburn . . .	Mr. W. Eccles
Cambridge . . .	{ Mr. K. Macaulay, Q.C.	Clitheroe . . .	Mr. M. Wilson
	{ Mr. Harvey Astell	Kingston-upon-	{ Viscount Goderich
Canterbury . . .	{ Mr. Butler Johnstone	Hull	{ Mr. James Clay
	{ Mr. R. P. Gipps	Lancaster . . .	Mr. B. Armstrong, Q.C.
Chatham	Sir F. Smith	Rye	Mr. Mackinnon
Derby	Mr. B. Horsfall	Huddersfield . .	Mr. W. R. C. Stansfield
Maldon	{ Mr. T. J. Miller		
	{ Mr. C. Du Cane		

DISQUALIFIED.

<i>Conservative.</i>	<i>Liberal.</i>
Frome Hon. R. Boyle	Tavistock Mr. S. Carter

DECLARED DULY ELECTED.

<i>Conservatives.</i>		<i>Liberals.</i>	
Tavistock . . .	Mr. G. R. Phillimore	Newry	Mr. W. Kirk
Bridgnorth . .	Mr. H. Whitmore	Guildford . . .	{ Mr. R. D. Mangles
Windsor	Lord C. Wellesley		{ Mr. J. Bell
		Derby	Mr. Laurence Heyworth
		Wigton	Sir J. M. Taggart
		Southampton . .	{ Sir A. Cockburn
			{ Mr. B. M. Wilcox

THE MADIAT ARE AT LENGTH RELEASED. The term of their imprisonment has closed, and before these lines meet the eye of our readers, they will probably be in this country. This intelligence was communicated to the Commons by Lord John Russell, on the 18th, and we are subsequently informed, by a correspondent of the 'Times,' that the gratifying event occurred on Tuesday, the 15th, and that they were immediately put on board the French post-office steamer

Hellespont, by the Tuscan authorities. They were not allowed to communicate with their friends, nor permitted to take some clothing which had been provided, and of which they were much in need. They arrived safely at Marseilles, and we are glad to learn that Dr. Steane, at the instance of the *Protestant Alliance*, instantly wrote to a gentleman in that town, requesting that their wants might be carefully provided for, and inviting them to proceed onward to England, and to take up their residence at his house. 'Rosa Madiai,' says the 'Times correspondent' at Marseilles, 'appears a very intelligent and interesting woman, but the mind of her poor husband is apparently gone.' We are not surprised at this sad intelligence. What we had previously heard prepared us for it. We hope, however, that the release now obtained, and the soothing influence of his wife's company, may have a beneficial influence in restoring him, at least in part, to his former health.

To the Grand Duke religious liberty owes little. Had he dared, these sufferers for conscience sake would still have been lingering in a Tuscan dungeon. A dependent on Austria, who has committed himself to an intolerant priesthood, he deemed the sacrifice of the Madiai a fitting expression of his political creed and papal faith. But the public sentiment of Europe was against him. He was branded by all intelligent men as a reviver of religious persecution. He had succeeded, contrary to his intention, in encircling his imprisoned subjects with an European interest. The English and Prussian governments interposed on their behalf; and the manner in which their communications were received, only tended to strengthen the conviction that the papacy was as hostile to the rights of conscience and the liberty of worship as in her palmiest and most ambitious days. We hope the *Protestant Alliance* will bear in mind that the Tuscan prisons contain other victims, and that nations professedly *Reformed*, are in some cases implicated in the same criminal practices as have disgraced the annals of Tuscany. There is a wide field open to them. Let them enter in and honestly occupy it.

THE PEACE OF EUROPE IS THREATENED FROM THE EAST. Austria and Russia are evidently intent on the dismemberment of Turkey. It is a question of time and not of principle. The latter is settled, the former only is unfixed. The demeanor of Turkey in the case of the Hungarian exiles is not forgotten, and a heavy retribution will follow if France and England do not interpose. We have not space this month to enter into details. These must be reserved for a future occasion, and we therefore restrict ourselves to the expression of a hope that our diplomacy will be unequivocal and decided;—honorable to our character and worthy of our position. We were criminally silent when Poland was blotted from the map of Europe. Let not this crime be followed by another of yet greater magnitude and of more disastrous tendency. Our ministry must show themselves men of nerve and resolution, as well as of sagacity, if they would meet the crisis which has arisen.

Literary Intelligence.

Just Published.

The Emperor of China *v.* the Queen of England. A Refutation of the Arguments contained in the Seven Official Documents transmitted by Her Majesty's Government at Hong-Kong, who maintain that the Documents of the Chinese Government contain Insulting Language. By P. P. Thoms.

Homilies for the Times. Addressed to those who Doubt and those who Believe. By a Country Preacher. No. 1. Revelation: Is it Necessary?

Two Thousand Miles' Ride through the Argentine Provinces. Being an Account of the Natural Products of the Country and Habits of the People. With a Historical Retrospect of the Rio de la Plata, Monte Video, and Corrientes. By William Mac Cann. 2 vols.

India: Its Government under a Bureaucracy. By John Dickenson, jun., M.R.A.S.

Self Denial. The Preparation for Easter. By the Author of 'Letters to my Unknown Friends.'

Ten Sermons of Religion. By Theodore Parker.

Observations on India. By a Resident there many Years.

An Investigation of the Trinity of Plato and of Philo-Judæus, and of the Effects which an Attachment to their Writings had upon the Principles and Reasoning of the Fathers of the Christian Church. By Caesar Morgan, D.D.

The Daughters of Zion. By Rev. S. D. Burchard, D.D. Illustrated with numerous Steel Engravings.

A Treatise on the Peculiarities of the Bible. Being an Exposition of the Principles Involved in some of the most Remarkable Facts and Phenomena recorded in Revelation. By Rev. E. D. Rendell.

A Treatise on the Assurance of Salvation. By Paton J. Gloag.

Mormonism Explained and Exposed. By Dawson Burns.

Notes Critical and Explanatory on the Prophecies of Jonah and Hosea. With a Summary of the History of Judah and Israel during the Period when the Prophecies of Hosea were Delivered. By Rev. Wm. Drake, M.A.

Sights and Sounds: the Mystery of the Day. Comprising an Entire History of the American 'Spirit' Manifestations. By Harry Spicer, Esq.

The People's Service of Song. A Tune-Book for the Pew. The Harmonies revised by George Hogarth, Esq. The whole Edited by John Curwen.

The Bible, the Missal, and the Breviary; or, Ritualism Self-Illustrated in the Liturgical Books of Rome. Containing the Text of the entire Roman Missal, &c. &c. By Rev. George Lewis. Vol. II.

The Hive and its Wonders.

A Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece. By William Mure. Vol. IV.

Tales of the Forest. Containing The Lotus-Walker and The Spoiler's Doom. By Snellius Schiekhardus.

The Indian Archipelago: its History and Present State. By Horace St. John. 2 vols.

Prayers Chiefly Adapted for Times and Occasions of Personal Trial. By John Sheppard.

The Working-Man's Way in the World. Being the Autobiography of a Journeyman Printer.